



A COMMUNICATION

As reported previously in other pages, the Association's professional staff has been afflicted with serious illness during the past two years. This high incidence of illness explains the delay in the publication of the Association's *Bulletin*, which we deeply regret. For this delay we bespeak the understanding of the members of the Association and of the other recipients of the Association's *Bulletin*.

RALEIGH E. HENNEDEY, *General Secretary*

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
of UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
Bulletin

Volume 40

Winter 1954-55

Number 4

Editor

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD

Associate Editors

WARREN C. MIDDLETON

GEORGE POPE SHANNON

Editorial Committee

JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY

WILLIAM T. LAPRADE

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

LOUISE POUND

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa. *Editorial Office:* 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$3.50 a year. Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

WILLIAM E. BRITTON (*Law*) University of Illinois

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT L. CALHOUN (*Theology*) Yale University

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

HAROLD NEWTON LEE (*Philosophy*) Tulane University

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Government, Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

GEORGE POPE SHANNON (*English*) Washington Office

STAFF ASSOCIATE

WARREN C. MIDDLETON (*Psychology*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1952-1954

FREDERICK K. BEUTEL (<i>Law</i>)	University of Nebraska
LEWIS C. BRANSCOMB (<i>Library Administration</i>)	The Ohio State University
ROBERT B. BRODE (<i>Physics</i>)	University of California
ROBERT K. CARR (<i>Political Science</i>)	Dartmouth College
HAROLD L. CLAPP (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	Grinnell College
J. ERSKINE HAWKINS (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Florida
ELMER LOUIS KAYSER (<i>History</i>)	The George Washington University
DONALD E. MILLER (<i>Biology</i>)	Ball State Teachers College
ROSALIND TOUGH (<i>Sociology</i>)	Hunter College
PAUL L. WHITELY (<i>Psychology</i>)	Franklin and Marshall College

1953-1955

JAMES C. CAREY (<i>History</i>)	Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science
MARY L. COOLIDGE (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Wellesley College
WILLIAM F. EDGERTON (<i>Egyptology</i>)	University of Chicago
THOMAS C. GEARY (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of South Dakota
RALPH W. MCCOY (<i>Biology</i>)	Fresno State College
DOUGLAS B. MAGGS (<i>Law</i>)	Duke University
JOSIAH C. RUSSELL (<i>History</i>)	University of New Mexico
WILLIAM LONSDALE TAYLER (<i>Political Science</i>)	Dickinson College
RALPH IRA THAYER (<i>Economics</i>)	State College of Washington
MARCUS WHITMAN (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Alabama

1954-1956

GLENN A. BAKKUM (<i>Sociology</i>)	Oregon State College
LEWIS WHITE BECK (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Rochester
JOHN W. CAUGHEY (<i>History</i>)	University of California at Los Angeles
PAUL R. DAVID (<i>Zoology</i>)	University of Oklahoma
CURT J. DUCASSE (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Brown University
D. F. FLEMING (<i>Political Science</i>)	Vanderbilt University
MERRITT Y. HUGHES (<i>English</i>)	University of Wisconsin
HARRIET E. O'SHEA (<i>Psychology</i>)	Purdue University
LELAND JAMES PRITCHARD (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Kansas
MARIAN M. TORREY (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Goucher College

FORMER PRESIDENTS

RALPH H. LUTZ (<i>History</i>)	Stanford University
RICHARD H. SHRYOCK (<i>History</i>)	The Johns Hopkins University
FRED B. MILLETT (<i>English Literature</i>)	Wesleyan University

CONTENTS

SOCIAL CLASS AND AMERICAN INTELLECTUALS, <i>Milton M. Gordon</i>	517
ACADEMIC FREEDOM, <i>Glenn R. Morrow</i>	529
THE AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL AS BLACK SHEEP AND RED ROVER, <i>Wilson Record</i>	536
ORIENTATION PRACTICES FOR NEW COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS, <i>Robert O. Stripling</i>	555
THE UNIVERSITIES OF ITALY, <i>R. C. Simonini, Jr.</i>	563
THE TUTORIAL SYSTEM, <i>William S. Rouverol</i>	593
STUDENT LIFE IN BAGHDAD, <i>Walter J. Mehl</i>	606
OF TEACHERS AND TAXES, <i>Malcolm Pye and John M. Kuhlman</i>	611
THE TEACHER AND AUTHORITY, <i>Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom of the Bowdoin College Chapter of the American Association of University Professors</i>	614
RIDICULE AND OTHER DETRIMENTS TO EFFECTIVE TEACHING, <i>Virginia Voeks</i>	621
THE "TECHNICAL" ART OF MANUSCRIPT REPORTING, <i>Robert K. Murray</i>	631
THIS PRESSURE TO PUBLISH, <i>John E. Owen</i>	638
OF THE SINGLE-INDEX GRADE, <i>Francis Stroup</i>	643
RELIGION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION, <i>Samuel I. Clark</i>	646
THE CHICAGO ARISTOTELIANS: A PERSPECTIVE, <i>M. E. Grenander</i>	657
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	667
MEMBERSHIP.....	668
INDEX FOR 1954.....	689
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	693

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

Contributors to This Issue

SAMUEL I. CLARK is Associate Professor of Political Science, Western Michigan College.

MILTON M. GORDON is Assistant Professor of Sociology, Haverford College.

M. E. GRENANDER is Associate Professor of English, State University of New York, College for Teachers at Albany.

JOHN M. KUHLMAN is Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Richmond.

WALTER J. MEHL is Dean of Students, Harpur College, State University of New York. He held a Fulbright Lectureship in Baghdad, Iraq, during the academic year 1953-54.

GLENN R. MORROW is Professor of Philosophy, University of Pennsylvania.

ROBERT K. MURRAY is Assistant Professor of History, Pennsylvania State University.

JOHN E. OWEN is Associate Professor of Sociology, Florida Southern College.

MALCOLM PYE is Associate Professor of Accounting, University of Richmond.

WILSON RECORD is Assistant Professor of Sociology, Sacramento State College.

WILLIAM S. ROUVEROL is Associate Professor of Engineering Design, University of California. He served recently as a Visiting Professor at Oxford University, England.

R. C. SIMONINI, JR., is Professor and Chairman, Department of English, Longwood College. During 1953-54 he was a Fulbright Research Scholar at the University of Florence, Italy.

ROBERT O. STRIPLING is Associate Professor of Education, University of Florida.

FRANCIS STROUP is Head of the Department of Physical Education, Southern State College.

VIRGINIA VOEKS is Associate Professor, Department of Psychology and Philosophy, San Diego State College.

SOCIAL CLASS AND AMERICAN INTELLECTUALS¹

By MILTON M. GORDON

Haverford College

Thoughtful students of the contemporary social scene must ever be on the alert to perceive new patterns, new groupings which emerge from the endless swirls and eddies of human interaction. Yesterday's sociological concept does not freeze the flesh and blood of today's interpersonal relations, and this is particularly true in an era of intense urbanism, industrialization, and rapid technological change. It was some such shift in focus which led twenty years or so ago to the incipient appearance of fresh perceptions about stratification in the United States and an appreciation of the *social* aspects of social class. Tardy as this perception was, and granted that it could have been presented with more precise analytical and research incisiveness, it was a major contribution; and it is interesting to note that in the great social stratification boom which followed, few of the heavy investors, with the exception of the textbook writers, stopped to thank Mr. Warner for his pioneering pains. As we know, quite the contrary.

Who guards the guardian? Who studies the student? The analysts of American social structure are likely to be academics, many, though certainly not all, of whom fall into the broader category commonly, if imperfectly, known as "the intellectual." Here again I suggest that while the man of ideas and the arts has rarely been studied seriously as a social type by professional students of society, although he has frequently interested the literary essayist and the pamphleteer, there are signs which point to his increasing relevance as a focus of serious social analysis. I shall not attempt to claim that the status of the intellectual is necessarily

¹ Address given at the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, in New York City, April 4, 1954.

the best indicator, by itself, of the health of a civilization. After all, we know that though he functions in ideological chains, the intellectual's status is high in the Soviet Union today. Nevertheless, in combination with other major factors, it is an important index of a culture's situation—its ethos—its total outlook on things. From the point of view of the contemporary student of American social structure, it is important to know where and how the intellectual fits into the social class system, how he relates to the cross cutting forces of ethnicity, and to what extent he is sufficiently aware of and interacting with his fellow-intellectuals to have a group consciousness. In terms of general social theory the problem may be viewed as one of understanding the intricate three-way interplay of common interest factors with social class and ethnic group considerations. Where, in other words, does the intellectual stand, and to what extent does he stand alone?

II

In the face of a dearth of empirical research dealing specifically with the position of intellectuals in American social structure, consideration of the topic must rely at present on general observation, occasional impressionistic essays by sociologists and *littérateurs* alike, and inferences made from research on related materials, such as the social class position of occupations in which intellectuals are characteristically found. In a field where insights abound, however, it is a diffident social scientist indeed who will refrain from adding his own. Such a lack of diffidence in the speaker is in no small measure a condition of the presentation of this paper. Let us remember, too, that an insight, at its best, is a statistical operation performed silently by the mind.

Definitions are necessary and primary. I shall not advance seriously the anatomical definition of an intellectual which emerged from the last presidential campaign—namely that he may be identified by the possession of a head which gives the appearance of an egg. Shades of Lombroso! With the caution, however, that social typologies are frequently simply heuristic devices for containing the ceaseless ebb and flow of human phenomena, intellectuals, I think, may be defined as persons who have a serious and relatively informed interest in ideas and the arts. They are people

for whom ideas, concepts, literature, music, painting, the dance, have intrinsic meaning—are a part of the social-psychological atmosphere which one breathes. To borrow from Russell Lynes' perceptive description of the subgroup of intellectuals which he calls "the Upper Bohemians,"¹ they are persons who see the general in the particular, who begin with a casual remark about a tomato and end in a discussion of organic gardening, who proceed from a reference to a Buick to an argument about the state of American industrial design. Occupationally, they are characteristically found in the professions—teaching, carrying on research, practicing law, medicine, social work, or architecture, for example; in the arts—writing, painting, dancing, directing; or, if in business, in those areas of buying and selling which deal with communications and the transmission of ideas and art—for instance, advertising or publishing. None of these occupations is made up entirely of intellectuals, and intellectuals will be found, if less frequently, in occupations which I have not mentioned. The age-cycle must also be taken into consideration, and any full examination of the occupational patterns of intellectuals must deal with their occupational origins, their orientation as students, particularly in the colleges, and their progress through the successive stages of occupational achievement.

If we are to inquire about the intellectual's place in the social class system, we must examine and define social classes. I believe that we are emerging from a period of alarms, discursions, confusion, conflict, and frantic partisanship over the meaning of the concept of social class, an emergence which bespeaks both a maturation of our science and a sharpening of our perceptions. Earlier clashes, among others, between partisans of economic determinism, and thus the economic definition of class, and the defenders of an exclusive and rather undynamic status group approach are giving way to the recognition that social class phenomena are multi-dimensional in nature. This point of view—briefly adumbrated by Max Weber and developed more systematically by recent writers, including members of this symposium—recognizes that, under the rubric of stratification, an economic dimension, a social

¹ Russell Lynes, "The Upper Bohemians," *Harper's*, Vol. 206, No. 1233 (February, 1953), pp. 46-52.

status dimension, and a political power dimension may be distinguished, and that other variables, such as cultural way of life, group separation, class consciousness, social mobility, and ethnic group identification, are a part of the total picture. This point of view also recognizes that the essence of wisdom is to study empirically the various relationships of the dimensions and variables, applying the term "social class" as a matter of somewhat arbitrary definition to one of the three major stratification dimensions. If we do this, then we study how economic power affects social status and vice versa, and how both of these variables interact with political power—how social grouping and cultural patterning are associated with social status or economic divisions—and so on, until we have exhausted the interplay of variables.

For reasons which have to do with the immediate stimuli which persuade people to pattern themselves into social groupings, I prefer to assign the term "social class" to the social status groupings of American society, admitting that the empirical evidence with regard to the degree of delineation of the groups is conflicting and that the status dimension itself contains many divisions, the relations among which are at times obscure and problematical. However, both my research and my informal observations lead me to suspect that rough divisions in American society based on a rather generalized concept of social status which derives from income, occupation, and style of life do exist, and that it is helpful to our understanding to refer to them as social classes. In these terms, I believe that an upper class, a middle class, and a lower class may be distinguished and that these rough social groupings in turn conceivably contain somewhat recognizable subdivisions. I am convinced, certainly, that the division between the upper-middle class and the lower-middle class is an important and functional one and that much of significance is obscured by certain contemporary observers of class, particularly of Marxist intellectual origins, who fail to give this distinction salience in their analysis.

III

If we try to locate the intellectual in the social class, or status group hierarchy, we must also consider, if briefly, his position along the economic continuum and his rôle in the political struggle. It is also pertinent to ask about the nature of his cultural behavior

patterns and the outlines of his relationship to the ethnic group system. Finally, we must seek to ascertain the patterning of his social life with a view to determining the possible presence of a new subcultural group on the American scene.

In examining recently a number of writings which deal, at least in part, with the general status of the intellectual in contemporary American society, I was struck by the existence of two polarized views. One is represented by a new work by Leo Gurko,¹ who decries the picture of the man of ideas and the arts presented in the stereotypes of popular fiction and the movies. The intellectual, according to this view, is regarded by the general American public as something of a boob—an impractical, awkward, socially naïve, sexually impotent fellow towards whom the standardized attitude is one of good-natured ridicule. Side by side with this myth of the intellectual, according to Gurko, is one which considers him to be a "city slicker," sly and dangerous, and at the very best unhappy or neurotic because of his high I. Q. Supporting the Gurko thesis, a rather extensive literature on the college teacher,² often a symbol of the intellectual man to the general public, testifies to the complaints about his felt status during the 20th century and is strikingly symbolized by the cartoon caricature of the New Deal as a wild-eyed and foolish-looking man of shriveled physical proportions attired in a cap and gown, which was a staple of the conservative press in the 1930's.

The other view, and to my mind the more convincing one, points to recent revolutions in taste, in the impact of scientists, both natural and social, in the availability of music, books, and magazines of fine quality, in the rôle of academics and other intellectuals in business and governmental operations. It posits a kind of artistic and intellectual renaissance in which industrial and communications technology and the complexity of modern living have conspired to give the writer, the artist, the social analyst, and the technical specialist a greater importance than they have ever had before in our culture. Thus Russell Lynes half seriously suggests

¹ Leo Gurko, *Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind*, New York, Bobbs-Merrill, 1953.

² For a critical review of this literature, see Richard H. Shryock, "The Academic Profession in The United States," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 38, No. 1 (Spring, 1952). See particularly pp. 50-54.

that the more familiar class system based on wealth or family lineage is gradually being replaced by a status order predicated on intellectual ability and artistic taste in which "highbrows" lord it over "upper-middle and lower-middle brows," and establish an uneasy camaraderie with the noncompeting and slightly suspicious "low-brows."¹ Signs of increased anti-intellectualism in the political and ideological realms may well be interpreted as an indication of the increasing importance of the man of ideas rather than the other way around, for do they not contain the implicit admission that ideas *are* powerful preludes and instigators to action? In this connection, I cannot refrain from quoting the cogent comment of David Riesman in a recent article, dealing with intellectual freedom:

In a way, the attention that intellectuals are getting these days, although much of it is venomous and indecent, testifies to the great improvement in our status over that of an earlier day. What might not Henry Adams have given for such signs of recognition! In his day the intellectual was no threat to anybody: whether clergyman or scholar, he had to defer to the "practical" men, the men of business and affairs. It is almost inconceivable today that a father should say, "Where Vanderbilt sits, there is the head of the table. I teach my son to be rich." In the much more fluid and amorphous America of our time, the writer, the artist, the scientist have become figures of glamour, if not of power. It is harder to say where the head of the table is.²

And Jacques Barzun, writing on America's new "Passion for Culture," quips: "*Pro Arte* is not just the name of a quartet, it is the motto of the age;" and goes on to add: "In the public eye the man of art and the man of thought have achieved status. We think we are riding a wave of anti-intellectualism because certain such men are attacked; the fact is that they are attacked because they have become important."³

As I have indicated, my own informal observations would lead me to support the thesis presented by Lynes, by Riesman, and by

¹ Russell Lynes, "Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow," *Harper's*, Vol. 198, No. 1185 (February, 1949), pp. 19-28.

² David Riesman, "Some Observations on Intellectual Freedom," *The American Scholar*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Winter, 1953-54), pp. 14-15.

³ Jacques Barzun, "America's Passion for Culture," *Harper's*, Vol. 208, No. 1246 (March, 1954), pp. 40-41.

Barzun: namely, that the general status of the intellectual is high and that he currently rides the wave of mass distributed culture which sweeps up the beaches of the American middle class.

For ascertaining more specifically the position of the intellectual in the social class structure we may find helpful accumulated research on the general status position of occupations. Here all signs point to the great esteem in which the professional man in America (which the intellectual is likely to be) is held. In the nationwide opinion poll on occupations carried out by the National Opinion Research Center in the middle 1940's, as reported by North and Hatt,¹ out of a total possible score of 100, "College Professor" and "Scientist" scored 89. Highest score was 96, earned by "U. S. Supreme Court Justice." "Physician" scored 93, "Architect" 86, "Artist who paints pictures that are exhibited in galleries" 83, and "Author of novels" 80. All of these scores are in the upper reaches of the scale, as may be seen by a glance at the average for clerical, sales, and kindred workers of 68.2 and for nonfarm laborers of 45.8. Business men also rank high on the scale but on the average lower than the professions. ("Sociologist," incidentally, was rated at 82, seven points below "college professor." Apparently we are basking in an unearned glow of incremental status secured by our more polished or our more useful colleagues.) All of the community studies, such as those of Warner and Hollingshead, place professions generally in the middle class or above, and their modal position, dependent, it is true, on type, appears to be the upper middle class rather than the lower middle.

Intellectuals will be found in the lower middle class, to be sure, by economic and occupational circumstance, though doubtless they are uneasy in its cultural patterns, and occasionally intellectuals will appear as deviant workers or tillers of the soil. Nor are they unknown in the stately homes and fashionable town houses of aristocracy. In an interesting study of the interplay of social and occupational prestige in Philadelphia, Digby Baltzell² found that 16%

¹ Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in Logan Wilson and William L. Kolb, *Sociological Analysis*, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1949, pp. 464-474.

² E. Digby Baltzell, "'Who's Who in America' and 'The Social Register': Elite and Upper Class Indexes in Metropolitan America," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), *Class, Status and Power*, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1953, pp. 172-185.

of the educators in *Who's Who* for 1940 in that city were also in the *Social Register*. Notice, however, that 75% of all Philadelphia bankers in *Who's Who* were in the Register. It seems reasonable to assume that the 84% of educators not found in the Social Register are somewhere in the upper reaches of the middle class.

When all considerations of status, style of life, and social participation are brought together, the most plausible hypothesis is that the basic social status position from which the intellectual looks out on the American scene is that of the upper-middle class. Intellectuals below this level are drawn upward to it by aspiration, intellectuals above it are drawn down by participation.

IV

If the social status of the intellectual is likely to be high, his economic position is likely to be highly variable, covering the range from the low-paid college instructor at the beginning of his career "making do" at \$3500 per annum to the public relations or radio network executive with a passion for Proust who banks yearly at \$18,000. What strikes me, however, is the question of consumption patterns, or the translation of income into way of life. Time and again one may note with interest the low-paid professional or artist finding an apartment in the gate house or over the garage of a former estate in a plushy neighborhood, with all this means in the way of ground space, general attractiveness, and conveniences, at the same rental that a semi-skilled factory worker with the same salary or more will be paying for a dismal flat or dilapidated row house in a run-down area. Moreover, Mrs. Young Intellectual today, horn-rimmed glasses, horse-tail hair-do, ballet slippers, and all, is not the reckless and extravagant bohemian of yesterday's Greenwich Village, but is likely to be a level-headed girl who makes her own and the baby's lovely clothes out of bargain materials, stitches up the living-room draperies, drives a shrewd bargain with the aid of Consumer Reports, and helps her husband put the finishing touches on the homemade or bought but unpainted furniture. My point is that even the relatively impecunious intellectual usually knows how to get the most for his money and to live in an upper-middle class setting with less. Some day I'd like to see some young sociologist or economist do a doctor's dissertation on the amount of

waste and poor value received in the consumption patterns of Mrs. Middle Majority, to use Burleigh Gardner's interesting phrase for the housewife of the lower-middle or upper-lower class, and for that matter the buying patterns of the lady in the class below.

With regard to political power, it seems fair to suggest that on the American scene intellectuals, as a group, have virtually none. In the gigantic politico-economic struggles carried on against each other by Big Business, Big Little Business, Big Labor, and Big Agriculture, to use Clair Wilcox's classification,¹ the intellectual stands on the side-lines, functions as an occasional supporting lobby, or draws his salary and his orders as an individual spokesman for one of the more powerful blocs. Who ever heard of Big Intellectuals? Individually, he may play a key and relatively anonymous rôle in a specific issue as the staff member of a Congressional or executive committee, or, as in the Stevenson candidacy, in a presidential campaign. If he can identify with labor or with Big Business or with any of the other power groups, then he may feel his own interests to be represented by these Goliaths. If he has an independent point of view, however, focused either on his own situation as an intellectual or on the community as a whole, he must feel relatively impotent, as the organizations which represent such views are weak or nonexistent. C. Wright Mills, in his book *White Collar*, has noted the current political impotence and apathy of the intellectual with bitter regret.² I wonder if there isn't something about the intellectual's general capacity for thinking abstractly and perhaps at times disinterestedly, that may help to explain his current disillusionment and withdrawal, in so far as they exist. During the 30's the intellectuals, generally, were in one form or another pro-labor, largely out of disinterested motives and emotions—labor was the underdog and the total scheme of things called for a righting of wrongs that existed. In the 1950's, organized labor is big and strong and still fighting—for organized labor, and hang the danger of inflation. The intellectual, I suggest, has some cause for bewilderment as he searches, or gives up

¹ Clair Wilcox, "Concentration of Power in the American Economy," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 28, No. 6 (November 1950), pp. 54-60.

² C. Wright Mills, *White Collar*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1951. See particularly Chap. 7.

the search, for political channels that speak for man, not just some portion thereof. Nevertheless, the intellectual, if he is wise, will develop a political interest and a political action. For, not to speak of the world scene, the current major domestic controversy concerns him greatly. If the reactionary forces which now bluster across the land should ever gain control of the Republican party and eventually the nation, the free intellectual will be one of the first targets of oppression. The stakes are high.

V

The man of ideas and the arts has an ethnic background. He is a Negro, a Jew, an Irish or Italian Catholic, a white Protestant, or something else. As the culturally assimilating forces of the American social class system exert pressures which bring him into contact with persons of different ethnic but the same social class position, the containing walls of ethnic communality are threatened—but not necessarily broken. The intellectual, because his interests are sharper and rarer, simply faces this conflict in acuter form. On the basis of his resolution of the conflict and the personality style which significantly influences it, I think we may distinguish three “ideal types” of response to the dual pressures of ethnicity and intellectualism. The representatives of these three types may be called “the actively ethnic intellectual,” “the passively ethnic intellectual,” and “the marginally ethnic intellectual.”

The “actively ethnic intellectual” remains within his ethnic group and focuses his intellectual interests precisely on his ethnicity. He is the cultural historian of the group, the theologian, the communal leader, the apologist, the scholar of its art, its music, and its literature. While he maintains a respectable acquaintanceship with the broader ideological currents and events around him, his primary interests and passions are reserved for the racial, religious, or nationality background ethos in which he considers his roots to be firmly placed. His is a confident approach, and he appears to be spared many of the problems of marginality. Incidentally, he may be a white Protestant as well as a member of a minority. White Protestants, after all, are simply our largest ethnic group.

The "passively ethnic intellectual" is a numerous type, though not necessarily the most numerous. Finding it easier, safer, or more in line with his personality style, he remains predominantly within the subcultural boundaries of his ethnic group and social class. If he is a Negro, most of his friends may be intellectuals but they will also be Negroes. If he is a Jew, he confines his friendships primarily to other Jewish intellectuals. While his interests are mostly of the broader, nonethnic variety, he gratifies them within the borders of ethnic communality. Occasionally, he looks wistfully beyond the ethnic boundaries at other intellectuals but he is not moved, or not able, to cross these boundaries in any substantial sense.

The "marginally ethnic intellectual" is, from many points of view, the most interesting and the most significant type. As the appellation indicates, he wears his ethnicity lightly, if not in his own eyes at least in the eyes of the world. Whatever his social psychology, he finds ethnic communality unsatisfactory and takes his friends, and perhaps even his spouse, wherever he finds them, so long as they share his fascination with Kafka and his passion for Heinrich Schuetz. To other, more conventional ethnics he is very occasionally a traitor, sometimes a snob, not infrequently, in Lewin's term, a "leader from the periphery"—mostly they let him alone; if he is successful, they will claim him—and he will be pleased by their claim.

It is the existence of the marginal intellectual and the persistent force of common interest in intellectual pursuits as a pressure against the walls of ethnic communality which leads me to my final point—the possibility of a new subcultural group emerging from the new patterns and the new interests—a subculture of intellectuals. This subculture would contain, ethnically speaking, neither hosts nor guests, would serve as a kind of bridge between ethnic groups, and would be, minimally, a haven for marginals, and at the most, literally a microcosm of a new world to come. A subculture, however, demands social interaction, a reciprocal social psychology of identification and recognition, and communal institutions. In the absence of formal research evidence on the status of any of these items, I can only make on each of them a brief and what I hope is an informed guess. I see considerable

social interaction, the beginnings of a social psychology—witness the common cues of FM radio, Hi-Fi, and Panda Prints—and as yet only the faintest stirrings in the realm of social institutions. The eventual outcome of this matter I leave to what should be, at the least, a very interesting future.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM¹

By GLENN R. MORROW

University of Pennsylvania

Academic freedom is once more menaced—not, as has usually been the case in the past, by special interests among alumni or in the church or the business community, but by the agencies of government itself. Those who appreciate the gravity of the issue are few. Outside the learned professions there are not many persons who have reflected on the meaning of this freedom we call academic, this freedom which the colleges and universities demand. And the word freedom has lost some of its magic, so that in defending academic freedom we can no longer count on benefiting from the stirring associations of a word which has served as a battle-cry so often in our history. In these tense days it is not freedom, but security, that is uppermost in our thoughts. And indeed our security *is* menaced. Never before have we confronted a more resolute, a more ingenious, a more unscrupulous antagonist than the Soviet Union, nor one more committed to our destruction. For the first time in our history we have seriously to face the possibility not merely of defeat in war, but of annihilation—the moral annihilation of our culture, if not the physical annihilation of our lives and resources.

So it is argued that security comes before all else. We must indeed survive if we are to remain free. This is an incontrovertible premise. But there have been instances in history—and our own people's past actions have furnished some of them—when it has been regarded as equally incontrovertible that certain freedoms must be preserved, not only for survival to be worth while, but even for making survival possible at all. This second premise is the one that now needs to be called back to our attention. What profit will it be for us to survive if we forfeit those qualities that

¹ Reprinted through the courtesy of the author and of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* (published by the General Alumni Society of the University of Pennsylvania), Vol. 52, No. 7, April, 1954.

have made America great, those qualities that have made our country—as a Greek friend wrote me recently—“a lighthouse to guide mankind into the harbor of peace and progress?” And it would be the height of folly to destroy, in a short-sighted scramble for security, our greatest assets in the grim struggle we are engaged in.

II

Academic freedom is one of these assets. It is not merely special affection for my profession that leads me to defend its prerogatives in these terms. Rather it is because the office of free inquiry to which the academic profession is dedicated is the symbol and the cornerstone of all those attributes of a great society, such as ours has been and still is, despite the powerful forces now at work to destroy it.

In contending for the freedom of the academic group, we are not contending that professors and students be granted indulgences for words and acts that are not permitted to others in our society, or a license unregulated by the laws and manners that bind our fellow men in what they do and say. The obscurest citizen has a right to make up his own mind on matters put before him, to write or otherwise express his opinions, and to vote them without hindrance. This is the solid rock on which our democracy is built. We hold that actions may be coerced, but opinions cannot be; and that if a man is compelled to give lip service to an opinion he does not hold, this will be the weakest of all his principles of conduct. We know that the opinions and convictions that men are not permitted to avow publicly assume an importance out of all proportion to their worth, and in the end are likely to erupt from their subterranean hiding with explosive violence. We know also that opinions that are now unpopular may become the slogans and guiding axioms of the future, not because they may be championed by a conspiracy that has put them over by force of revolution, but because they may win out in the market-place of ideas. This free trade in opinions, this competition for superiority in insight, this rivalry in the pursuit of truth is the dynamic source and creative spirit of our free society.

Why then should professors and their students be bound by

special directives, forbidden to participate by conviction in this exchange of ideas which is the birthright of other Americans? We are told that they have a peculiarly important position in the community and that their position entails special obligations. This is indeed true and important. The obligations the academic profession imposes are the obligation to think more objectively, to examine evidence more carefully, to avoid the hasty and biased inferences that the uninformed and undisciplined mind so easily accepts. Its function is to furnish an example of free and unprejudiced inquiry and to provide a reservoir of disinterested counsel and insight.

But these are obligations that can least of all be enforced by putting the teacher on a tether, delimiting the area within which he is free to roam, proscribing the causes he is not allowed to champion and the organizations he is not allowed to join. This procedure argues a touching confidence in the wisdom of those (sometimes self-appointed experts) who draw these nice boundaries between the permissible and the forbidden. And our own recent experience has shown that since the boundaries are not easy to find with exactness, they will be drawn more and more narrowly. Once you have proscribed one area as forbidden ground, what touches on it next becomes an object of suspicion because of its very contiguity, and this in turn being proscribed carries the infection of distrust still further inward, without end.

But the greater charge against such a method is its very futility. Thoughts cannot be confined in this fashion, nor men's desires and ideals. This is particularly true of men whose habits and interests and whose choice of the academic profession predispose them to the attraction of ideas. The better the men we have in this profession, the less will they be impressed by these airy boundaries between what they may and what they may not inquire into. One might as well try to keep the pigeons off City Hall by putting up a fence around Penn Square.

The better way, the only way, to enforce these obligations which we all recognize are laid upon our profession is by applying the standards of competence and character. It takes no little degree of achievement to qualify for a responsible position in the academic world. A man's activities are under constant scrutiny—if he is a

younger man, by his students, by his seniors in his department, by his examiners and the readers of his writings; and in later years, by his students and by all his colleagues, on his own campus and elsewhere. These are the proper judges of his competence. They are not infallible, to be sure; but it would be difficult to name any other group better qualified to be his judges. They are also the best judges of his character—his integrity, his fair-mindedness, his devotion to truth, and his loyalty to that conception of free inquiry on which our country stands. There is no more critical audience than a class of undergraduates—unless it be a meeting of a faculty, or a faculty committee. These groups have a keen perception for stodginess, for prejudice and special pleading, for insincerity. And when a man has received their approval, I can conceive of no higher court by which their decision may rightfully be reversed.

III

Freedom to inquire and to teach, subject to the obligations I have mentioned, and subject to the judgment of his colleagues on his competence and character—this is what we mean by academic freedom. When we in the academic world demand freedom as I have defined it, we are asking for no more than what is necessary if we are to discharge our function adequately. Unlike other groups in our society, our professors have not enjoyed an increase in salary commensurate to the rise in the price-level of the past few years. This is a manifest injustice, but not a crippling one. What would be truly devastating to morale would be to take away from us, or to undermine by insinuations, by blanket accusations of disloyalty, by inquisitorial procedures, the very conditions essential to the conscientious performance of the high duty laid upon us.

And to undermine our academic institutions is not merely an injustice to them and to those whose lives are bound up with them; it is a blow to the very foundations of our society. This is the point with which I started and the touchstone of all opinions on this matter. Unless we see that academic freedom is the heart and center of the American way of life, we shall not judge it rightly. A society based on the concept of human dignity, on respect for the opinions of even the humblest man, if they are his opinions,

freely and openly arrived at; a society dedicated to the constant search for the better way and to the freedom of enterprise and imagination which that search requires; a society that believes in orderly change, rather than revolution and violence—such a society cannot put restrictions upon inquiry in its universities and colleges without cutting the root, or circling the main stem, of all the varied and abundant growth of its free institutions.

For if the professor is not free to speak out, who will be? The academic life requires certain renunciations; it requires a withdrawal from the ordinary competition for money and place. But in return it offers a kind of security, a security relevant to learning and teaching, and only prized by those who have a desire to do these things. Is there any other group so well placed, so well equipped by temperament and training, to speak the truth as they see it? And if we find that we can no longer turn to these men and women whose profession is disinterested inquiry and expect to receive from them an honest answer, to whom can we turn?

This is why I say that the freedom called academic is the symbol and cornerstone of a free society. It is the incarnation, the embodiment in specially favorable conditions, of the ideal of free inquiry. Our academic institutions are the sensitive center of the intellectual life of a community, the clearing-house for all drafts that may be presented upon our loyalty or credulity. I am not saying that the colleges and universities do perfectly what it is their manifest duty to do. They carry their treasure in earthen vessels. And it should be the constant concern of all persons in the academic community, and of all who are interested in the welfare of our country, to increase the competence and the character of those who are engaged in it. But this result will not be attained by indiscriminate denunciations from groups that make a business of patriotism, as they define it, or attempts at control by persons who have little knowledge of the purpose of academic life and no sympathy with its professions. Such methods can only tend to dishearten and demoralize those in the profession, and to deter other men and women—and particularly the best of them—from entering a career so discredited.

It may be said that the alarm I have expressed is out of all proportion to the menace. Have there really been any attempts to control or limit the freedom of the academic inquirer?

It is true there has been no open attack upon our central position: we still acknowledge that the colleges and universities should be free of government control in the sphere of inquiry, free to explore the world of ideas under the accepted standards of intellectual competence and moral integrity. But there have been attempts to weaken our defenses, efforts to alienate the sympathies and distort the judgment of our supporters within and without the profession. Public inquisitions of distinguished scholars, lists of books and journals officially labelled "subversive," demands for loyalty oaths that impugn in advance the integrity of those who are expected to establish their loyalty by an abjuration of unknown and unspecified heresies—if these are not attempts to undermine the prestige of the profession and intimidate its members, what are they? Fortunately these attacks have for the most part been countered by the saner judgment of our people and their elected representatives. Despite what may be said about us abroad, despite what some of our own number have said in the heat of controversy, academic freedom is not a "dead duck" in America. Professors and their students are not cowed. The very vigor with which these assaults upon us have been resisted testifies to the strength of our professional conscience, and to our determination not to surrender weakly the conditions without which our profession loses its dignity and importance.

Nevertheless these attacks have undoubtedly done damage. Some professors have been humiliated and dismissed; two or three great universities have lost the respect they once enjoyed as centers of free inquiry; busy men have been distracted from more important tasks by the guerilla war being carried on against them; and countless persons have begun to restrict the scope of their interests and associations, lest they be found unwittingly to have had connections with some one whom some future inquisitor may deem subversive. And some students perhaps have begun to suspect a timidity among their professors, even where none in fact exists, and to discount their most fervent and loyal utterances as merely a conventional bow to the official line. What is the gain to our freedom and security in all this? When a student suspects that his professor's failure to pay particular attention to dialectical materialism in a course in social philosophy is because he "doesn't

dare do so in these times," when a conscientious professor "pulls his punches" in talking about communism because, as a self-respecting man, he does not relish having it said of him that his loyalties and dislikes are colored by outside pressures, have we gained or lost in our deadly struggle with communism for the minds of men?

IV

This brings me to the final and most decisive consideration. If the damage I have mentioned could be justified by a corresponding gain in national security, if the attempted limitations upon academic freedom could be shown to be a necessary austerity in an admittedly grave national crisis, none of us would protest. But the result of the policies I have mentioned is not to husband our resources, but to squander them recklessly. The way of these policies is the way of panic and self-destruction. We are engaged in a grim struggle with Soviet totalitarianism. We have learned of its frightening new methods of subterranean and fanatical conspiracy. But it will do us no good to strike blindly in all directions, belaboring and disheartening our loyal fellow-citizens just on the chance that we may strike some enemy of the state. In order to win this struggle we shall need all the energy and initiative and wisdom of our best men. We must choose our weapons with the greatest care, lest they do more harm to us than to our enemies. Our greatest ally in the present struggle is the loyalty of free minds, with the varied resources of intelligence which they can summon for our benefit and protection. The universities and the colleges are one reservoir of such intelligence, and what makes them especially important, they are the intellectual seed-bed of the next generation. To argue that our safety requires us to turn these centers of free inquiry into indoctrination centers is to exhibit a pitiful lack of faith in the reasonableness of our cause. We in the academic world have not lost faith that the way of intelligence and free inquiry is the American way and will eventually lead us to victory.

THE AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL AS BLACK SHEEP AND RED ROVER

By WILSON RECORD

Sacramento State College

The salient aspect of "proletarian" movements in the United States has been the highly unproletarian character of their participants. The vanishing Socialist party, which would reorganize the whole of society in the image of the workers' state, finds its leadership and most of its following among the preachers, professors, and other men of learning. It has even drawn support from the ranks of the plutocrats; certainly it has elicited more response from the silver spoon than from the calloused hand.

In like fashion the Communist party, while proclaiming itself (on occasion) to be the vanguard of a revolutionary workers' movement whose destiny is the recasting of society in the soviet mold, still secures its direction and most of its support from among the writers, the teachers, the journalists, the artists, and other professionals. The men of toil are few and usually impotent in its ranks.

The fact that these and similar movements have found their chief resources among the intellectuals is hardly open to debate. Indeed, it has become standard procedure to distinguish radical movements in America from their counterparts in other countries by reference to this peculiarity. But though a high order of agreement exists as to the facts, their explanation remains obscure. One is prompted to ask why the Communist movement, for example, has evoked such meager response from the American working classes; or, more important for our present purposes, what peculiar fascination it has held for a considerable number of intellectuals. In attacking the latter question, it should be said at the outset that those who have sought fresh insights from the literature of confession with which ex-Communists have recently deluged us have been rather ill-rewarded.

II

Any hypothesis must begin with some awareness of the character of these movements—their principal ideas, their historical contexts, their socio-psychological dimensions. But more important is a grasp of the nebulous position which the intellectuals as a social species have held in the American environment, a status which can be characterized in terms of the late Robert E. Park's "marginal man." The intellectual is *in* American culture, but he is not *of* it in the sense of playing a well-defined rôle that is continuously reinforced by a feeling of "belonging."

American intellectuals live and move and have their being in a society which places peculiar emphasis upon the arts of communication. In no other country are time and resources given so freely to developing the basic language skills of reading, writing, and speaking. Since intellectuals are, by their very definition, primarily concerned with ideas and words and distinguished by their superior capacity to employ these instruments, one would naturally suppose that American society would elevate them to a revered status. Paradoxically enough, the reverse is true. As Granville Hicks observed some years ago, the place occupied by the American intellectual is a "dubious and unhappy one."

And it is not any recent turn of events that has relegated him to the nether rungs of prestige. Historically intellectuals have usually been assigned two rôles in the great American drama: either as bit actors, making minor entrances and exits and perhaps affording an occasional moment of comic relief, or as villains providing a foil for those who are out to demonstrate that while goodness may not be more beautiful, it is certainly more profitable, than truth.

There is consequently nothing new in the humiliations which the recent restrictions on thought and speech have inflicted upon intellectuals; the current strictures have merely deepened and salted old wounds. For a long time the professional man of ideas has been familiar with the business end of the knife and the stick. For in the market society in which he lives his wares have been deemed alternately dangerous and useless. And, according to the particular climate of the moment, his compatriots have demanded that he be suppressed or that he produce some saleable commodity.

In some degree American intellectuals have been perennially suspect. Such acceptance as they have achieved has been highly tentative, always overshadowed by the contempt, the mistrust, the subverted envy which men who live and act hold for those who only think and talk. A business society has no real use for the intellectual *qua* intellectual; and America epitomizes now, as it has in the past, an order whose highest rewards are reserved for the industrialist and the financier. The kind of rejection which Durkheim has characterized sociologically as "alienation" is the continuing experience of intellectuals in our day.

Writing more than a century ago, DeTocqueville observed that the intellectual innovator in this new country was subjected to multiple pressures which tended to impose upon him a self-destroying conformity, to channel his creative efforts into popular, common-sense molds. The later development of mass communication and a mass society merely emphasized a tendency that was present all along. DeTocqueville, although basically sympathetic with the democratic experiments of the early 19th century, was keenly aware that the doctrine of equality, when carried to the level of ideas, reduced thought to opinion and made fundamental criticism highly suspect.

This astute French nobleman saw further that America's intense preoccupation with material things, with the building and manipulation of a physical environment as opposed to reflection upon its meaning, as opposed also to concern with final moral purposes, could but reduce intellectual activity to second-rank importance. What he described was a budding business society that has grown to full flower—or weed—only in our time. It is no accident that DeTocqueville is more relevant and readable today than a century ago.

Henry Adams, who could "look upon the whole of America as his own private back yard" and yet "felt homeless in a world dominated by fast-grabbing businessmen," voiced the intense bitterness of some intellectuals sixty years ago when he wrote:

For my part, hating vindictively as I do our whole fabric and conception of society, against which my little self squeaked protest from its birth, and will yet protest till its death, I shall be glad to see the whole thing utterly destroyed and wiped away. With

communism I could exist tolerably well, for communism is rather favorable to social consideration apart from wealth; but in a society of brokers and Jews, a world made up of maniacs mad for gold, I have no place.

Neither the offensiveness of his unveiled anti-Semitism nor the naïvete of his nineteenth century view of communism can obscure the sharpness with which Adams perceived the position of the "idea man" in the American community.

Nearly a half century after Adams, Edmund Wilson voiced a similar feeling. Writing of the stock market crash and the depression of the early 1930's, he observed:

... to the writers and artists of my generation who had grown up in the Big Business era and had always resented its barbarism, its crowding out of everything they cared about, these years were not depressing but stimulating. One couldn't help being exhilarated at the sudden unexpected collapse of that stupid gigantic fraud. It gave us a new sense of freedom; and it gave us a new sense of power to find ourselves still carrying on while the bankers, for a change, were taking a beating.

But the times have changed. The brokers and bankers again wear seven-league boots, and they do not tread lightly. Their spokesmen fill the legislative halls, staff the apparatus of state, and waffle their bottoms in the seats of power. There can be no uncertainty about who is taking the beating now. Wilson's writers and artists no longer feel that sense of opportunity, of fulfillment and usefulness, which characterized their mood of two decades ago. Lacking any unified sense of direction and shocked by the complexity of issues which were seen initially in two-dimensional simplicity, many have run—some have limped—from the scene, sadder but perhaps not wiser men. Armed with the poem and the essay, Peter Vireck searches for an intellectually refined and morally tenable conservatism. Dwight MacDonald throws in the sponge after an heroic effort to publish a fundamentally radical political magazine, now using a portion of his fine talents on "Profiles" for the *New Yorker*. Some intellectuals have retreated into the private mysteries of esoteric cults. Others have merely ceased their sojourns in the rugged political lands, finding that the cultivation

of their dainty academic gardens is a full-time task. And a horde of former Communists and fellow-travelers have deluged publishers with confessions that make pikers of St. Augustine and Rousseau.

Some of this latter group have now shifted their faith and acquired substitutes for the Marxist rosaries; for them the habit of fingering beads will always be compelling. But these tortured strivings have brought little solace. Apologies for one's past, confession of old errors, the recanting of earlier beliefs—none can bring social acceptance or psychological fulfillment in the present; for if the newly returned prodigal sons continue to function as intellectuals, their rôle will remain a marginal and precarious one. Whitaker Chambers, for example, may find the best drawing rooms opened to him when he tells the business community what it wants to hear about communism; but if he chooses to join the general traffic in ideas, he will find himself hawking his wares at the service entrance.

Historically then, the American intellectuals have been forced frequently into the rôle of social critics and political deviants. Possessing the gift of tongues but lacking the power to act, their only alternatives have been to withdraw in face of the issues of the day, or to demand changes in the existing order of things. Their identification with radical movements is much more a consequence of the "push" of immediate environment than of the "pull" of abstract, logically consistent, and aesthetically satisfying ideologies.

III

However, we cannot account adequately for the partiality of some intellectuals to radical movements in general historical and sociological terms. Helpful as these approaches are, and rewarding as they may be at specified levels of analysis, they do not enable us to examine the compulsives of various subgroups from which intellectuals have emerged. Writing recently in the *American Journal of Sociology*, Reinhard Bendix pointed out the difficulties inherent in efforts to apply socio-historical concepts to what are essentially psychological phenomena. What was important, he insisted, was clarification of the specific problem at hand and the

recognition of the limitations of various instruments. In examining the psychological aspects of the intellectual's attraction to leftist movements we would do well to keep these and similar suggestions in mind.

We should not assume that all intellectuals are people of high intelligence. However, as a group they probably stand well above the average in this respect. We should not take for granted, either, that they are radical in a social or political sense, although they invariably constitute the ideological spearheads of nonconformist movements. Carlyle was a conservative and a critic of 19th century industrialism. A contemporary of Marx, he was every bit as much the intellectual as the man with whom modern communism is associated. Balzac was not required to take up residence on the Left Bank in order to castigate the men of trade or to lament the plight of the factory worker in 19th century France.

Intellectuals are not as a group nonreligious in their philosophies. Obviously, some of them are, but just the opposite is true of many others. One of the principal factors in the growth of Catholicism has been the ability of the Church to attract a substantial number of intellectuals, depriving its enemies of potential allies and channeling to its own advantage the creative talents of critical minds. The late Carl Becker in a delightful series of lectures, *The Heavenly City of the 18th Century Philosophers*, showed how the men of Enlightenment, the intellectuals supreme, were quite capable of erecting a shrine to the Goddess of Reason.

Intellectuals do not consist exclusively of the formally well-educated. Eric Hoffer, whose little book, *The True Believer*, is a masterpiece of intellectual creativity, is a former migratory worker with very limited schooling. Currently he is employed as a long-shoreman on the San Francisco docks. However, in our day and age formal education becomes increasingly a "prerequisite," as the college bulletins put it, to the attainment of an intellectual rôle.

Individuals who man the various professions—doctors, lawyers, journalists, teachers, professors, ministers, writers, artists, and government officials—are not necessarily intellectuals, although most of them are skilled manipulators of words and display some concern with ideas. The bulk of American intellectuals secure a living in these and related occupations. They constitute in some

respects a distinct social class, as the late Joseph Schumpeter pointed out.

It should be emphasized, then, that not all American intellectuals, or even a substantial portion of them, have been attracted to radical and nonconformist movements. And it is important to reiterate that we are concerned only *with certain sub-types of the general species*, those intellectuals who, for reasons we shall attempt to examine in subsequent pages, made meaningful commitments to ideologies and organizations the goals of which were drastic changes in the existing order of things. Our observations can be made concrete by reference to the relationship between various types of intellectuals and the communist apparatus in this country during the past three decades.

Many American intellectuals have been cast constantly in the rôle of social critics. While they might not have called, as did Henry Adams, for the root and branch elimination of business society, they were always something less than enthusiastic about Horatio Alger. They never *really* believed that God gave John D. Rockefeller his gold, even when they had the word of the Standard Oil founder that this was the case, even when as a self-proclaimed vicar of the Lord he used his wealth for godly purposes by endowing the University of Chicago.

Communists appeared on the American scene in the 1920's in the rôle of social critics also. Their initial offerings were doctrinaire, splitting hairs with an assiduity, with phrases from Lenin that would have put the medieval scholastics to shame. But this did not bar their initiation into that nebulous fraternity of outcasts and shakers. Both Richard Wright and Granville Hicks in recent years have described the meeting of certain intellectual types and the communists on the common ground of criticism of the business-industrial order. They note too that eventually it was the Communists who took possession of the field—and of the intellectuals who remained in armor.

Communists, in line with the doctrines of Marx, and especially the polemics of Lenin, regard themselves as members of an elite. In their self-image they are equipped by special insights that enable them to rise above their class conditioning, to discern the real nature of history, to grasp the roots of social causation. Conse-

quently, they visualize themselves as seers of the future and leaders in the present. Intellectuals tend to regard themselves as fraternal brothers in an exclusive order of men whose special talents place them above and beyond the common run of people. The Communists' idea of an elite had, without doubt, a strong appeal to those intellectuals who had a similarly strong self-conception.

The fact that intellectuals in the Soviet Union, which is offered as a model of communist society, enjoy high favor and wide popular prestige has been an important factor in the response of American intellectuals to Stalinism. Many of them compared their own marginal rôles in an indifferent and frequently hostile environment with that of their counterparts in the "workers' fatherland," and they longed for a change. This was especially the case in the 1930's, when, in spite of their outward sophistication and presumed defensive skepticism, intellectuals were real suckers for left hooks. They refused to peer behind the Soviet façade; or perhaps they were unable to see clearly because of an intense will to believe that the peel and the core were the same thing.

However, it must be recognized that one of the sources of Stalin's strength was the capacity of the regime to provide status and a certain amount of power for the intellectuals. The state-imposed restrictions on thought and speech are not such as to alienate permanently the writers and talkers, who seem quite willing to forego independent critical functions in exchange for power. (We make a serious mistake in assuming that the primary concern of the intellectuals is always free intercourse in the area of ideas.) It is worth mentioning that official pronouncements of the Soviet government now refer to the state as being composed of workers, farmers, and *intellectuals*. A full professor in a Russian university usually has as big a car and probably as many medals as an unpurged general.

Alex Inkles of Harvard's Russian Research Center, in a recent article on social stratification in the USSR, emphasized the relatively high status held by the men of learning as a class. He quoted from one ranking official who complained that parents were no longer inspiring their children to be skilled workers, soldiers, technicians, and collective farmers. On the contrary, they were posing intellectual rôles and tasks as life goals for their offspring.

A further measure of the intellectual's prestige under Stalin has been suggested by Eric Hoffer in a recent letter. He proposed that one examine the types of individuals migrating to the USSR and compare them with those who flee that country. Hoffer's "hunch" was that the inbound traffic would consist almost exclusively of intellectuals, while the outward-bound would include primarily workers, engineers, and military men. As far as I know, the data whereby one could test the proposition are not available, but I have an idea that Hoffer is right. In any event, numerous American intellectuals have been drawn to the communist movement because of the prestige, real or presumed, which their like numbers hold in the USSR.

IV

Another motive underlying the identification of some American intellectuals with communism involves a sense of guilt and the absence of any meaningful social responsibility. This would appear to be especially true of those who are born to the purple, and who employ their wealth and energies in advancing a movement whose aim is the violent elimination of their initial social class interest. Communist fund-raisers and recruiters learned long ago that an especially vulnerable group was the well-educated people of inherited wealth. The self-made man who "got his" by his own sweat gave the proselytizer the toe of his over-shined shoe or the back of his well-ringed hand, or at best—or worst—a lecture on the American way of life. But somewhere along the way, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, for example, was convinced that he was a parasite and that something was wrong about a social order that doomed him to be forever rich—and forever useless.

In a somewhat different sense, a feeling of guilt and alienation lies behind the communist stance of those individuals of lower and middle-class origin who attain high career success, along with a certain intellectual sophistication. Many of them feel tragically divorced from those persons with whom in earlier years they had intense, formative relations. They seek some means of reidentification with their less successful kinsmen. But this relationship cannot be cemented by direct and continuing personal contact; the time is too long, the gap too wide. Joining the communist

movement then becomes a vicarious means of re-establishing at a symbolic and political level a relationship that was initially personal. It is one means of saying, from a distance, "I have not forgotten; I am still with you." Trumbo, Lawson, and Odets probably found these and similar motives compelling.

Equally important in explaining political deviation among certain types of American intellectuals is the factor of boredom. Bored by necessitous preoccupation with talk, by the dismal gulf separating men of words from men of actions, these people have frequently found relief, something new and exciting, in the communist movement. They live largely by words, but not by words alone. The time comes when out of sheer ennui they feel compelled to partake of the highly seasoned meat of action. Their tastes are frequently uncritical, indiscriminate, and they are probably in for a severe case of indigestion. But even in their dyspeptic misery there will at least be the satisfaction of having broken the milk diet of symbols. Those intellectuals who may have much in a material sense and are bored represent a threat to the *status quo* that cannot be equalled by those who have nothing, but who are nevertheless absorbed in the task of keeping alive and praising the Lord. The cry is not "something," but "more."

Social psychologists have recently employed the concept of "self-hatred" to describe the behavior patterns of racial and religious minorities. While one takes certain liberties in applying it to intellectuals, I am convinced that it is at least suggestive and a potential aid in understanding their response to communist appeals in this country. Intellectuals in many respects are people of minority status, although discriminated against because of an acquired rather than some innate characteristic.

But the discrimination is none the less real. Such a group, as Arnold Rose has recently demonstrated, in time develops its own morale and a system of interlocking defenses against the larger, oppressive society. But few of its members can escape completely the impact of adverse judgments and pressures exerted by the majority. Many of them will come to believe that their alleged inferiority, inadequacy, or viciousness is true. They react by seeking to escape their origins and by losing their identity with their fellow-sufferers. Thus we have anti-Semitic Jews, Negro-hating Negroes, and Oriental-baiting Chinese.

It is quite conceivable that anti-intellectual prejudice in America has the same sort of impact psychologically on a considerable number of persons whose "mark of oppression" is intellectuality. They may feel compelled to deny the one thing that is definitive of their beings, and to denounce other intellectuals in the vocabulary of the businessman, the administrator, or the politician in need of a whipping boy. But Negroes do not change the color of their skins by mouthing Rankin-type slogans, and intellectuals do not transform themselves by shakily assuming the stance of practical men.

One means whereby erasure of identity has been attempted is affiliation with the communist movement. These vulnerable intellectuals, filled with self-hatred and contempt, have sought to be born again, to create new selves, to shear off old brands. Some of them went into the communist-led labor unions, where they tried to look and talk like workers, to roll cigarettes like workers, to use the vernacular of the loading gang and the blast furnace crew. But once the agitation and stirring up were done with, once the issues of words and ideologies were settled, they were no longer needed.

The labor movement of the 1930's, which they had helped build and in whose behalf they had enjoyed working and suffering, was reclaimed by coal miners, steel workers, bricklayers, and plumbers. Like the captains of industry, the lieutenants of American labor can get along without the intellectuals. It is a significant commentary that recently Kermit Eby, in counselling younger intellectuals desirous of becoming a part of the labor movement, advised them in effect to redraw themselves in the images of the business agent, the walking delegate, and the pie-card carrier.

V

A special factor in the appeal of communism to a significant group of American intellectuals in the 1930's was the latter's loss of function as a consequence of the depression, and the denial of long-held career aspirations, especially among the younger men. The evidence seems fairly conclusive that many of the communist recruits came from educated members of the middle classes, who were either unemployed or working in jobs low in income and prestige and commanding only a fraction of their distinguishing talents. The unemployed worker frequently becomes passive and apathetic.

But the intellectual who has lost his occupational rôle or is denied expected opportunities begins to ask more crucial questions and to get ideas. He is a dangerous man in any society, regardless of its political form.

Sigmund Neuman, in describing the Nazi movement, in his *Permanent Revolution*, pointed out that one of Hitler's sources of strength was the unemployed brain workers—the clerks, teachers, lawyers, journalists, and other professionals. Among this group were many intellectuals who saw in Nazism a chance to recapture positions of prestige wiped away in the postwar disorganization of German life. One may be impressed by the large number of intellectuals who fled the homeland of Goethe and Kant following the temporary triumph of the new barbarism; but equally impressive, at least to me, is the overwhelming number who remained and found satisfying functions within the Third Reich.

Communism in the 1930's represented radical reform and revolution to which quite a number of disfunctional intellectuals in this country responded. Since the latter, unlike their German counterparts, never had any great prestige in their homeland, they tended to turn a deaf ear to the fascist-like movements which clamored for a return to something outwardly resembling the old order of things. The anti-Semitic and anti-Negro character of American fascism was another deterrent to the recruitment of intellectuals. While the latter are quite capable of ethnic prejudice, they are not likely to express it openly and organization-wise.

It has been assumed that many of the intellectuals who became a part of the communist movement in this country were motivated largely by idealism, that they embraced the new secular gospel because of their sensitiveness to the suffering about them and their desire to improve the lot of a wretched humanity. There is a great deal of truth in such claims and we should not underestimate it, especially at a time when we are all too prone to judge hastily and ask the important questions later.

However, it is now apparent that a not insignificant number of American intellectuals became a part of the communist movement largely for selfish reasons. They looked upon the Stalinist apparatus as a means of gaining "contacts," of securing "exclusive" information, of "sharpening" their individual talents, of advancing

a given career interest. It was a highly conscious—and a highly dangerous—game of exploitation, and frequently they were unaware that the cards were stacked against them at the very outset.

Communist recruiters were by no means blind to these motivations. They assumed that weak and insecure intellectuals, by virtue of their very weakness, were incapable of any love for the masses or any burning concern for the welfare of the common man. Hence in approaching this type of prospect the skilled agent emphasized not what the former could do for the proletarian cause by work and self-sacrifice, but what the party apparatus could do for *him*.

Several years ago Walter Reuther observed that the communists provided a very complete valet service for, among others, certain intellectuals. Not only would the Stalinists press a man's pants for him, but would massage his ego and relieve him of the awesome burden of making up his mind. This observation was without doubt verified in the experience of some of the committed intellectuals who, after a time, became aware that they were the prisoners of their own political maids and butlers and no longer the masters of their own house. One is reminded of John L. Lewis' famous, but not last words, "I can use them." But who used whom is hardly a matter for debate any longer.

In *Commentary*, Granville Hicks recently pointed out that one of the chief attractions of the communist movement for the intellectuals of his acquaintance was not the ideal good under which it paraded, but its underlying evil. He argued with keen insight that the doing of evil is one means whereby an individual compensates for weakness; it is a means for attracting attention to an otherwise obscure self, a technique for distinguishing one from the common run of men, a weapon for striking back at an unrewarding and offensive society. Those intellectuals who became a part of the Stalinist movement in America must have realized at one time or another, if they were given to any honest self-searching, that their own motives were frequently not humane but selfish, and that it was the inherently evil aspects of communism to which they were responding. If so, they faced two alternatives. They could get out and hope to change their ways, believing that self-discovery led to a better self. Or they could stay—at the price of complete

surrender of intellectual integrity and to utter, final cynicism. Fortunately, not many chose the latter course.

VI

The Communists in the United States directed many of their appeals to the intellectuals among racial and ethnic minorities. It was assumed that many of these cultural subgroups, because of their disadvantaged position, would be more willing to work for drastic changes and to follow a radical leadership. The talented men among an ethnic or racial minority, who are denied the status and opportunities open to other persons of like accomplishments, are an important source of a radical intelligentsia. Robert Michels, in his classic work, *Political Parties*, pointed out that the leadership of the German socialist party and many of the trade unions in the pre-World War I era was in the hands of Jewish intellectuals. These men usually had been highly successful in their careers, but because of anti-Semitism they could not share the social acceptance accorded non-Jews of like accomplishments. Hence they turned to the working class, shaking the calloused hand, largely, one suspects, because they could not tip the fingers of polite Lutheran ladies.

The early Socialist party in the United States was composed almost exclusively of members of ethnic and nationality minorities. It was not until after World War I that the separate language federations, a focal part of its organizational base, were disbanded. Both the leadership and the members of the Communist party during the first decade of its existence here were drawn largely from immigrant peoples, especially those who had only recently arrived. In both cases it was the intellectuals among the minority groups who were most responsive to radical appeals. The same phenomenon can be observed today among the latest substantial addition to the immigrant stream, the Puerto Ricans.

Among Negroes in the United States the politically radical tend to be drawn not from the men "farthest down," but from those segments of the upper group where social literacy and cultural achievement are at their highest. In discussing the colored intellectual, however, a distinction must be made between political and racial radicalism. Those who have made connections with

the communist or some similar movement are not conspicuous among the confessors and recanters of recent years. The reason I think lies in the fact that they did not make the same kind of commitment as their lighter-skinned brethren. They tended to identify communism with racial equality and to appraise the movement as an instrument for removing discrimination, which impinged most forcefully on the Negro man of words and talents. To repudiate this aspect of their past would be tantamount to a denial that at one time opposition to prejudice and segregation was wrong.

The darker intellectuals were also disposed to take a much less starry-eyed view of the Stalinist enterprise than were many of their white compatriots. They soon discovered that even in the vanguard of the proletariat "white chauvinism" was not unknown. No one can read Richard Wright's essay in *The God That Failed* without realizing that behind his outward hope in joining the movement there was the inner suspicion that this too was another case of men, white men, bearing gifts. The other contributors to this volume—Gide, Silone, Fischer, Koestler, and Spender—with perhaps one exception, were had, and had completely, by the Communists. Not so the creator of Bigger Thomas, and, I think, most other Negro intellectuals. Perhaps it is significant that only Wright among the above writers came from a lower class background.

It must be pointed out too that the Negro intellectuals have had considerable experience with carpet-baggers. It should come as no great surprise that they listened with a somewhat calloused and critical ear to those who appeared in the 1930's, carrying Moscow music rolls and playing a rather strange variation on the old theme of "forty acres and a mule," or striking again the notes that Marcus Garvey once sounded from Freedom Hall.

VII

It has been argued with some justification that communism feeds on privation, suffering, and unemployment. Indeed, this assumption underlies much of the foreign aid undertaken by this country in recent years. But it is an extremely over-simplified proposition, especially when applied to the intellectuals in America

and elsewhere. Although they can die without it, men do not live by bread alone. And the intellectuals especially do not measure an ideology with their stomachs. The misery and privation of a mass of people provide the intellectuals with a grievance and offer them an opportunity for leadership. And without the intellectuals the mass will starve rather than become nationalist, or communist, or fascist or something else.

Morris L. Ernst and David Loth, in their recent book, *Report on the American Communist*, point out that the party recruited very heavily in this country from among the middle classes, that the people who joined were not usually hungry, or at least not hungry for the items on a grocery shelf or a market counter. They needed not bread, bacon and beans, but status, recognition, some sense of usefulness. They were persistent shoppers, and if these items were not to be had in one place, they searched out another.

The spread of literacy and higher education in America has greatly intensified both occupational and social status competition. A college degree, which was once the birthright of upper-class sons and daughters, in time became the hard-won opportunity of the middle group. Today it is the assumed everyday right of the many. It is now a prerequisite to upward mobility, the recognized means whereby one gets his foot on the social ladder and starts kicking and shoving and climbing.

But a business-industrial society, even when going full-steam, cannot provide the rewards or command the highest energies of the increasing number of young men and women who have been schooled with the expectation of filling prestige-loaded and financially rewarding jobs. The individual whose anticipations are thus denied is forced to reflect not only upon personal shortcomings but upon the character of the social order within which his failure occurred. The issue for him is not a job *per se*—it never was—but the kind of work that recognizes and challenges his maximum abilities as he has defined them.

Some may respond by apathy or indifference, but in many cases critical examination goes beyond the self, leading to an unfavorable comparison of the existing way of things with meaningful and, under the circumstances, highly appealing alternatives. A law school graduate, for example, who fails the ever-stiffening bar ex-

amination, and who might otherwise have ended up a junior partner in some corporation firm, becomes an articulate advocate of left-wing unionism, an organizer of front committees, a proponent of doctrines that Blackstone never heard of.

Seymour Harris, in a little book, *The Market for College Graduates*, views with alarm, as well he should, the enormous number of B.A.'s, M.A.'s, and Ph.D.'s turned out in recent years by our mass production colleges. He points out that the number of jobs available to these certified men of learning is quite limited. He recognizes that the career frustration of these degree holders is likely to be a crucial source of social unrest in the future.

Many of these over-educated and under-employed men can and will be recruited by the communist or some other extremist movement. For any situation which forces well-schooled people to think, to become concerned with ideas, to assume an intellectual stance is an opportunity for deviant political movements. Ironically, the business society which must of necessity train men to staff its technical and administrative apparatus also equips them to undermine its foundations.

VIII

No less than those whom he regards as his unsophisticated inferiors, a certain type of intellectual in America and elsewhere finds himself in constant need of some absolute. His quest for certainty is never ending; he is not deterred by the repeated discovery that yesterday's great truth is today's minor footnote. He is unique in his inability to compartmentalize his conflicting experiences. Thus he lacks the means whereby the man of action avoids any searching concern for his own and the world's irrationalities. This type is determined that his right hand will always know what the left is doing, leading invariably to much anguished juggling and fumbling. He cannot face an open-ended and indeterminate world with the resignation of the mystic or the don't-give-a-damn attitude of the practical man. The more confused the era in which he lives, the more frantic is the search for some key that will open the door to total understanding.

One thing stands out clearly in the motivations of a considerable group of intellectuals who were drawn to the American communist movement during the past three decades: they were seeking some complete explanation of a chaotic world. They wanted responses that would answer not only the need for specific and immediate knowledge, but would prove logically and aesthetically and emotionally satisfying as well. Above all, they were searching for assurances that the future was certain, and they scanned the Moscow skies for some sign that they rode its wave. Arthur Koestler has indicated many times that to the intellectuals whom he encountered in the communist movement in the 1930's the Stalinist ideology seemed to have all the answers and to have them all the time.

Corollary with this, among the intellectuals who severed their ties with communism, there were those who found rebirth and new certainties in authoritarian religion or in some like ideology. What is significant about Chambers, for example, is not how much he changed during fifteen years and eight hundred pages of confession, but how much he remains the same old Whittaker.

We know now that the National Socialists in Germany recruited heavily among former communist intellectuals after 1928. More recently the communists in East Germany and in Poland have had no great difficulty in persuading the intellectual devotees of Pilsudski and Hitler to shift their allegiance to a new movement and a new leader. Perhaps we need no reminder that it was Mussolini who confessed that he owed one of his greatest debts to Lenin and that Stalin was never beyond borrowing from Hitler, most recently underscored by the anti-Semitic purges in Eastern Europe.

If those American intellectuals who joined in the communist movement at some time during the past three decades have been disillusioned in their mating with Stalinism, this is no guarantee that they will be more critical, more discerning in their subsequent choices of ideological partners. At best, perhaps, they will realize how capable they are of misleading not only themselves, but the people to whom they address their appeals. To be honest with oneself is never easy, and in the case of the intellectual his facility

with words becomes frequently not a clarifying instrument, but a means of self-deception. The intellectuals in America need recognition, a feeling of usefulness, a sense of "belonging." And if they cannot pursue these goals in humility and compassion, perhaps they will recognize the complexity of their quest. If they were suckers for left hooks in some of the recent rounds, they need not become set-ups for right crosses in the remainder of the fight.

ORIENTATION PRACTICES FOR NEW COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS

By ROBERT O. STRIPLING

University of Florida

During the last few years several studies concerning the problems of new college faculty members have been published.¹ An analysis of these studies reveals that the problems faced by the newcomer to a college faculty are many in number, and affect all aspects of life—personal and social as well as professional. A number of articles have also been written on the importance of institutions of higher learning adopting orientation practices which will assist new staff members in coping with their problems. Several authors and educational groups have suggested specific practices that institutions might employ.² However, a careful review of the literature failed to reveal any reports of studies involving an attempt to find out what orientation practices new college faculty members might suggest as a result of their actual experiences in becoming adjusted to a new position and institution.

¹ Hattery, Lowell H., "Joys and Sorrows of College Teaching," *School and Society*, October 9, 1948.

Kelly, F. J., "How Do Faculty Members Like Their Jobs?" *Higher Education*, May 1, 1949.

Lewis, E. M., "The Beginning College Teacher," *Journal of Higher Education*, January, 1947.

Stripling, Robert O., "Problems of New Members of the College Faculty," *Clearing House*, February, 1953.

² American Council on Education, *Improving College Instruction*. (Fred J. Kelly, ed.) Washington: The Council, 1950.

Goodhart, Abraham S., "Selection and Induction of New Faculty Members," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, January, 1953.

Johnson, B. Lamar, "The Induction of Faculty Members," *Problems of Faculty Personnel*. (John Dale Russell, ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.

National Conference on Higher Education, *Current Trends in Higher Education*, 1949. Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1949.

President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

The author recently asked 86 faculty members who had been in their present positions for three years or less to list orientation practices which they felt were helpful or would have been helpful to them in adjusting to their new positions. These faculty members represented 79 institutions of higher learning in 31 different states. Included among the sample were both large and small colleges as well as state and privately supported institutions. The faculty members were distributed among the various departments of these institutions. Two hundred college administrators who had expressed an interest in the study were also asked to contribute their ideas. They represented 200 institutions in 42 states.

An analysis of the responses indicated that the size of the institution did not materially affect the type of orientation practices suggested; rather, it was the question of adapting a particular practice to local conditions. The following are representative of the variety of orientation practices suggested:

Before Appointment

1. *A visit to the campus.* This practice was suggested by over 50 per cent of each group. One faculty member from a large state-supported institution stated:

I would never accept another position without visiting the institution. Nothing they wrote me, or my friends told me, about the institution where I am now working was incorrect. However, I knew my first day of work that things were not as I had expected. I am sure that a short visit to the campus would have revealed this.

The following statement made by the dean of the faculty of another institution seems to be somewhat representative of the trend of thinking among many college administrators:

Two years ago our institution adopted a policy of not employing any faculty member until he had visited our campus. When we consider that a new appointee represents a potential investment of some one hundred and fifty thousand dollars in salary alone, we feel that the two to three hundred dollars that we might spend on such a visit is small.

A visit to the campus not only gives the prospective appointee an opportunity to gain an impression concerning the total environment of the institution but will also enable him to get first-hand information about such things as the kind of office space available, the quality of secretarial help, housing conditions, and working relationships among faculty members. It will also give several members of the staff an opportunity to pass judgment on the candidate, thereby assuming some responsibility for his selection.

2. *Supply printed materials.* Several of the faculty members reported that they had found it particularly helpful to receive printed materials about such things as the philosophy of the institution, a description of the staff, a statement relating to personnel policies, and an overview of the administrative organization and educational program. Several administrators reported that their institutions followed a practice of sending such information to persons whom they were considering for appointment. One stated:

We send such information before the candidate visits our campus. He is then in a better position to ask specific questions about our program.

After Accepting the Position

Ordinarily there is a period of several weeks or months between the candidate's acceptance of a position and his reporting to duty. Many of the respondents felt that this was an opportune time to help the new appointee acquaint himself with the institution's program and the community into which he and his family were about to move. Such practices as the following were suggested:

1. *Personal letters of welcome.* Several of the new faculty members indicated pleasure at their wives' having received letters of welcome from the wives of faculty members at the institution where they had accepted a position. This, they felt, did much to create good feeling on the part of their wives toward the new institution. It gave them a stronger feeling of security in moving into a strange environment.

2. *Supply printed materials.* One dean of a large institution in a metropolitan area stated that for several years it had been found helpful to follow a policy of mailing to each new faculty member, soon after appointment, a kit of printed materials containing such things as a faculty handbook; a transit guide for the city; a faculty football ticket blank; samples of forms frequently used, such as change of grade cards and teaching load reports; a student handbook; information concerning the guidance and placement centers; regulations concerning grades and information pertaining to faculty counseling. Such information is not only helpful to the new faculty member, but is also of interest to his family. Several of the new faculty members participating in the study stated that they felt that such a practice had been, or would have been, helpful to them.

3. *Summer newsletter.* One faculty member reported that his institution followed the practice of sending a monthly summer newsletter to all staff members. Included in the letter was a biographical sketch of each new appointee, including such things as club activities, hobbies, and other personal interests. Such information had often led staff members with similar interests to write to the new appointee.

4. *Local newspaper.* Several staff members indicated that they would have been pleased to have received copies of a local newspaper. One administrator reported that his institution followed the practice of sending a three-month's free subscription for a local newspaper which began immediately after the appointment of the new staff member. He felt that this had done much to aid the new staff member and his family in getting a "feel" of the community even before arrival.

5. *Campus newspaper.* One faculty member reported that his best insight into the student body affairs of the institution was gained by the institution's policy of mailing to each new appointee the current issues of the campus newspaper.

6. *Personal information about the new faculty family.* Fifty per cent of the new faculty members stated that they had had difficulty in establishing satisfactory social relationships with the people of the community. It was suggested that the new appointee be requested to fill out a personal data sheet, giving information other than that which appeared on his application blank.

Similar information should be obtained about his wife and children. This information could be forwarded to social and civic clubs in the community with the request that they invite the new faculty member to participate in their organization.

7. *The faculty club.* One faculty member reported that his institution mailed him information about the faculty club, including a complimentary membership for one semester.

8. *The alumni association.* The alumni association and its activities can do much toward gaining the support of the new faculty member in alumni activities. It was suggested that alumni in the same vicinity of the new appointee might be asked to make a personal call on him.

9. *Assistance in securing housing.* Over 50 per cent of the faculty members indicated that they had had difficulty in locating adequate housing. One respondent stated:

We haven't located satisfactory housing yet. However, we have a warm spot in our hearts for the institution because of the effort that was made by the housing office and several individual faculty members in helping us find our present apartment. We are now "on our feet" and can look for ourselves.

Several were critical of the lack of help they received in securing housing. One stated:

The dean wrote that housing conditions were bad but he was sure they could help us in locating something adequate. When we arrived, all he did was refer us to a local real estate agent. A little personal interest on his part would have made my wife and me feel much better.

Upon Reporting for Duty

The following are representative of the types of orientation activities suggested as being helpful to new faculty members upon reporting to work.

1. *A sponsor for each new family.* Several institutions reported that their wives' club appointed one faculty wife to sponsor each new family. It was her responsibility to greet the new family and see that they got the help they needed, plus an opportunity to begin making friends.

2. *Introduction to faculty families.* Many of the respondents mentioned the importance of activities that would help the new faculty member become acquainted with families of staff members. Much emphasis was placed on such activities as faculty receptions, wives' clubs, newcomers' clubs, faculty picnics, and other outings, teas, dinners, and informal parties. One institution reported that the wife or husband of the new staff member was invited to come to general orientation sessions which were held prior to the beginning of the semester.

3. *Introduction to the community.* Much emphasis was placed on the value of activities that would help the new faculty member become acquainted with the people in the community. One faculty member reported that the local junior chamber of commerce held a reception each fall in honor of all newcomers to the city. Faculty families were given special invitations. This gave them an opportunity to meet the city officials as well as other citizens of the community.

Professional Adjustment

Many suggestions were made concerning practices that might be used in helping the new faculty member become oriented to his work. The following are among those most frequently mentioned:

1. *Arrangements for the new faculty member to report for work at least two weeks before classes begin.* By reporting early, the new appointee can get his family settled, begin to acquaint himself with the details of his work, and get somewhat familiar with the new environment in which he is to work.

2. *Orientation conference.* Thirty-five per cent of the new faculty members stated that their institution had conducted a special orientation conference for them before classes began. They rated this practice as most helpful. Several of the administrators pointed out that such conferences were most beneficial when held as a part of a general fall planning conference for all faculty members.

3. *Assignment of a new faculty member to an old faculty member.* Twenty-four per cent of the faculty members reported that this procedure had been used in their case. They rated this early contact as one of the most important helps to their orientation.

4. *Teaching load.* Twenty-five per cent of the administrators stated that their institutions followed the practice of a light teaching load for the first semester. They felt that it was one of the most important practices of their orientation procedures for new faculty members. One faculty member stated:

A two-thirds teaching load during the first semester gave me an opportunity to organize my course work better, get familiar with the program of the college, and learn more about the students. I do not feel that any new staff member should be expected to plunge right into a full teaching schedule.

Another wrote:

This was the most helpful technique used to assist me.

5. *Personal conferences.* Fifty per cent of the new staff members wrote that they had had opportunities to hold short conferences with key administrative officials of their institution. They felt that this was important to their proper orientation. One faculty member from a large institution wrote:

I realize that our president and dean of the university are busy people. However, it seems that they should recognize the importance of having short interviews with newcomers. I was on the campus a year before I met the president.

6. *Observation of registration procedures.* The new faculty member and administrators who had experienced this practice rated it high. The new staff member should be given an opportunity to observe student counseling as well as the mechanics of registration.

7. *Meeting the students.* Around 30 per cent of the respondents indicated that student receptions had been of value in helping them to become acquainted with members of the student body.

8. *The use of films, charts, slides, and other visual aids.* Ten per cent of the new staff members indicated that materials of this nature had been especially helpful to them in gaining an understanding of the total program of the institution. One respondent stated:

A twenty-five minute motion picture helped me gain an overview of the institution's entire program that otherwise would have taken me months to get.

Another stated:

The charts showing the administrative organization of the university, its distribution of staff according to rank, etc., and its budget were most helpful.

9. *Assignment to committees.* Many of the faculty members expressed disappointment that they had not been given what they considered key committee assignments. It is important that new staff members be assigned to standing committees where they can begin to contribute to the program of the institution. Such assignments, of course, should be made with due consideration of abilities and interests.

It is recognized that the adjustments of the new faculty member and his family cannot be accomplished by merely improving in a mechanical way orientation practices such as those mentioned above. Satisfactory social and professional relations grow out of an atmosphere of friendliness and concern about the personal welfare of staff members. However, it was felt by the majority of the faculty members and administrators participating in this study that many institutions had failed to give due consideration to the type of orientation practices that should be employed to meet the needs of new faculty members at the local level. Institutions of higher learning should gain the cooperation of new staff members in determining what problems they have faced in becoming oriented to their work and attempt to develop orientation practices that will meet these problems.

THE UNIVERSITIES OF ITALY

By R. C. SIMONINI, JR.

Longwood College

To the American observer the Italian university system represents a curious combination of over-all centralization of administration and local decentralization of instruction. The discretionary powers of the Ministry of Public Instruction in Rome and the assigned powers of the Superior Council of Public Instruction which governs all Italian universities, both public and private, have no parallel in any state educational system in our own country. On the other hand, the universities themselves are decentralized into virtually autonomous faculties or schools which are usually housed in widely-scattered buildings. The concept of a "campus" and "college life" is foreign to Italian universities.

As is the case in other Western European countries, the American educator is generally impressed with the relatively more rigid and intense instruction given in the Italian elementary and secondary schools and the relatively less intense instruction given in the universities which, under contemporary conditions, are not really elastic enough in curriculum nor rich enough in equipment to carry out programs of general education and of specialized graduate study as we know them in America. But one must recognize that the educational background and needs of the university student in Italy are not the same as those of his American counterpart. One must reflect, too, that it is perhaps too easy to criticize the affairs of one country from the background of one's training and experience in another. In the main, therefore, this study will attempt to be informative rather than argumentative, but where educational practices seem to be at variance with professed ideals it should not be amiss to point these out.

II

The structure of the modern Italian university is the result partly of ancient tradition and partly of the upheavals of war, politics,

and reform which have plagued the country during the last hundred years. Italian universities are the oldest in the world, and it is claimed by some that their prototypes can be found as long ago as the Platonic academies of classical antiquity. Legal recognition of them, however, did not come until after the so-called "renaissance of the twelfth century," when the medieval *studium generale*—a place of study open to all—had gained such political power that emperors felt it expedient to officially recognize or authorize it, as the case may be. The medieval universities of Italy existed originally as specialized schools—medicine at Salerno and law at Bologna, for example—and so it is that the University of Bologna became the oldest recognized university in Europe when the students of its law school, founded, according to tradition, in 1088, were granted special immunities and privileges by the royal decree of Frederick Barbarossa in 1155.

By the middle of the fourteenth century, the universities of Padua, Naples, Rome, Perugia, Pisa, and Florence had also attained "official status." The fact, then, that the ancient Italian universities began as independent schools or faculties in urban centers has some bearing on their local, decentralized organization today.

The essentially medieval structure of the Italian university persisted until the advent of Fascism in 1922. Ever since the Casati Laws of 1859, which placed the responsibility for public education on all levels in the hands of the state, the universities have been state-controlled; so the Fascists were not attempting anything new when they set out to reform higher education in Italy. No one would now say the universities were not in need of some reform, particularly with respect to adapting the curriculum to the needs of modern life. The Fascist government was most fortunate in having at the time as its Minister of Public Instruction one of the world's greatest philosophers, Giovanni Gentile. The Gentile Reform of 1923 was thorough and far-reaching, affecting every institution of learning of all ranks, from *scuola materna* (kindergarten) to *istituto superiore* (specialized school of university rank). In general, the state endeavored to assume over-all responsibility for public education, with private institutions cooperating in the enterprise. There was considerable redefining of purpose, re-ordering of curricula, and elimination of dual effort in order to

bring about more effective financial support from the state. Excessive indulgence as well as excessive specialization characteristic of many university faculties was discouraged. An attempt to raise academic standards was made through a standardization of academic requirements for degrees and the institution of state examinations for professional licenses. However, all of this later gave the Fascist state the prerogative to intervene in university affairs, in spite of the fact that the idealism and spiritual emphasis of the Gentile Reform originally encouraged liberty of instruction and university autonomy in administrative, didactic, and disciplinary matters. Gentile himself fell into disrespect during the war years, when he continued to support the Fascist regime. He was finally killed by Italian partisans in Florence in 1944, the tragic example of a man whose greatness is now clouded by events of the last few months of his life.

Further reforms were in order for the Italian university system in 1935. Universities hereafter could no longer determine what courses were to be taught in their faculties. Instead, a catalogue of 37 curricula and degrees was established with further stipulations as to what were to be *insegnamenti fondamentali* (required courses) and the *insegnamenti complementari* (elective courses) for each degree. Rigorous tables, called *ordine degli studi*, unified the offerings of all universities. Students, moreover, were required to pass special examinations in all required subjects and in a fixed number of elective subjects before taking the final examination for the degree. The government continued to lend its support to projects designed to modernize and revitalize organization and equipment: in some universities scattered schools and institutes were gathered together in one place in order to centralize the local as well as the national administration; modern buildings were erected to house university faculties; student residences were established. The University City of Rome, Mussolini's pride and joy—"the chief center of studies in Italy, according to the Duce's will"—and the sorely needed southern University of Bari were founded during this period. An attempt was also made to integrate a sports and physical education program with military exercises and cultural activities. Such reforms resulted in a healthy reordering of the universities, and they remain an essential part of the system even today.

But the Fascists eventually began to impose ideology on the universities, with tragic results. Having one foot in the door already, so to speak, the government tried to make the universities instruments of propaganda. The rôle of the universities was conceived as "shaping that harmony between the physical and moral attributes which governs Fascist life," and students and faculty alike were judged according to how effectively they evinced the Fascist spirit and temperament: "enthusiasm, courage, decision, the spirit of self-denial, unselfishness, and unfailing faith in the great Idea and in the Duce who animates it with his genius." A number of pedagogues of the old school who were found to be out of step with the Fascist legions had their university chairs suppressed. Other professors, such as Benedetto Croce and Gaetano Salvemini, went into voluntary retirement or exile in protest. (For their defection these gallant spirits suffered the indignity of having their names omitted from the roll of illustrative professors included in a grandiose volume published by the Fascist University Groups in 1934!) Fear in the universities, however, was soon followed by destruction when Mussolini cancelled the achievements of twenty years in the great betrayal.

The Second World War left the educational system of Italy partially destroyed in its physical properties, disorganized in its functions, and confused in its programs. Physical damage to the universities from the hazards of war seemed at first irreparable. Many buildings were either destroyed or severely damaged by bombs and shells; others were sacked of equipment by retreating Germans; still others were requisitioned as hospitals, quarters for troops, and even as defensive strong points during the battle for Italy. Meanwhile, libraries and scientific equipment were deteriorating from being either closed down or moved. Among the great universities severely damaged during the war we need mention only Bologna, Cagliari, Florence, Genoa, Milan, Naples, Pisa, Turin, and the Catholic University of Milan.

III

The postwar government had to face not only the tremendous expense involved in reopening and re-equipping the universities,

but also a student crisis in huge numbers of returning war veterans which even under normal conditions would have taxed university facilities. Fortunately, however, funds for the restoration of buildings and equipment were made available from the Marshall Plan and from private contributions from the United States and South America. The Italian government also allocated all possible assistance to the restoration and, in addition, provided assistance to partisans, prisoners of war, and war orphans attending the universities. Marshall Plan aid was efficiently employed, and by today the universities, in physical resources at least, have made a complete recovery.

With respect to internal problems of the universities, only make-shift arrangements were possible until the Constitution of the Italian Republic, which became effective on January 1, 1948, set forth the principles regarding public education which were to serve as a guide in a new School Reform. The School Reform, decreed as an inquest on April 29, 1949, is still in progress, since legislative action evolving from the recommendations of the Reform has been slow to follow.

The results of the School Reform are impressive, not so much because of its innovations as because of its remarkably successful deductive and democratic procedure. The logic of the Reform was deductive, in that all solutions were continually tested by how well they effected the objectives of the Constitution. Recommendations and opinions were submitted by teachers in every segment of the school system as well as by individuals and by groups having an interest in public education. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Public Instruction sponsored public conventions and discussions and concerned itself with statistical research and distribution of materials necessary for the inquiry. An official journal carried progress reports and other material relative to educational philosophy, adult education, kindergartens, public libraries, technical education, teacher preparation, religious instruction, state examinations, elementary and secondary education, and so on. Contributing also to this intense activity were numerous commissions which visited the schools in order to ascertain the condition of school property and materials, scholastic standards, teaching methods, efficacy of school directives, and the economic and social condition of the

teachers. It was not always easy to reconcile majority and individual recommendations or qualitative and quantitative criteria with the evidence of research, or the facts of a regional situation, or even the original objectives of the inquiry; but the common purpose and good will of the participants, together with the realistic approach of the Reform, produced graphic and, for the most part, acceptable conclusions.

Financial and legislative support for the School Reform was sought by the Minister of Public Instruction, Guido Gonella, the lawyer and journalist who founded the underground newspaper *Il Popolo*, which became the official organ of the Christian Democrats, in an address before the Italian Senate on May 5, 1950. Gonella's compelling exposition is a masterful synthesis of the situation and seems at once idealistic and practicable. The frontispiece of the new Reform is *libertà*, and Article 33 of the Italian Constitution is emphasized throughout: "The arts and sciences are free and free must be the teaching of them." And in order to codify this principle of freedom and protect it from possible abuse, the Constitution goes on to declare: "The Republic will establish the basic norms of instruction." It is these fundamental principles, Gonella points out, that the School Reform of the past two years has labored to delineate. Furthermore, Gonella wisely concludes, the Reform must be gradual, evolutionary, experimental—*una riforma senza miracoli*.

A number of problems peculiar to the university were considered during the Reform. Indeed, the complex and tenuous nature of some of these matters is still the occasion for lively debate in university circles. One point of disagreement is university autonomy, a question not unknown to American professors in discussions of academic freedom. In spite of considerable opinion expressed to make university instruction in Italy a state monopoly, the Reform—and the Constitution—allows private institutions to offer instruction within the framework of norms set down by the state. Public education in Italy, then, is to be construed as a pluralism, with public and private schools not in opposition but in cooperation with one another. Basically, the government prescribes the administrative and instructional organization of all Italian universities, but each institution has its own published statute containing listings

of faculties, schools, professors, admission requirements, courses, requirements for degrees, prerequisites for examinations, scholarships, and so on. The private school, thus, is free to operate as long as its organization and curricula meet the state requirements.

Particular objection to the rigid and uniform organization of the Italian university system is often heard from the well-respected Catholic University of Milan. Among the arguments cited in defense of university autonomy is the rather curious but widespread belief in Italy that private colleges and universities in the United States are generally superior to state-supported institutions, a misconception which one is at some pains to correct. Eventually, the reform foresees a decentralization of state administration, services, and responsibility, transferring to the Italian provinces and municipalities these privileges and duties. This, of course, would approximate the system current in the United States, but whether the economic and political situation in Italy will ever reach the point where such decentralization can be satisfactorily accomplished is questionable.

The School Reform has also posed a challenge to the universities in underscoring the principle of education for all. This is a relatively new concept in Italy, where for generations both secondary and higher education have been the privilege and the province of the few. Under present laws, eight years of schooling are compulsory, and some progress has been made in raising the literacy rate, which stands today at 92% (cf. U. S. 97%, Britain 99%, France 93%, Spain 54%). But on the secondary and higher levels the ancient distinction between popular education and education for the elite must still be eliminated. Thus, the School Reform has attempted to substitute criteria of merit and capability for criteria of birth, position, and privilege.

The achievement of higher education in America that most impresses Italians is that "everyone goes to college," which is sometimes equated with the other mythical assumption about our fabulous country that "everyone has a car." The Italian Republic, therefore, has endeavored to broaden the scope of higher education through a constitutional provision that has a truly Jeffersonian ring: "The capable and meritorious, even though

they be without the means, have the right to enter the highest levels of instruction. The Republic will make possible this right through scholarships, payments to families, and through other provisions which will be awarded through competitive examinations." Since 1951 it has been mandatory that at least 15% of total university revenues and one-third of the state contribution be used for the collective and individual assistance of students (e.g., scholarships, student housing, dining halls).

Other more specific reforms on the university level will be discussed later. But for the moment it will suffice to note that the School Reform has made possible more pointed and constructive criticism of the Italian university system. The official government publications coming out of the Reform provide both a guide to university organization and instruction and a focal point for criticism and modification. In its democratic intent and its emphasis on freedom, the Reform makes a notable break with latter-day Fascism.

In its immediate influence on public education, and particularly in its application to the universities, the School Reform has been a failure. It was perhaps too ambitious in scope and too costly for an economically and politically unstable government to bear. In most respects, therefore, prewar university traditions in Italy remain essentially unchanged.

IV

To the American understanding, an Italian university must be defined as follows: a degree-granting institution offering specialized instruction for scholarly, scientific, or professional ends. There are, then, 39 institutions of university rank approved by the Ministry of Public Instruction, which offer 45 different approved degrees (*laurea* or *diploma*). The government guarantees the parity of courses offered and degrees awarded, and students may transfer freely from one university to another. All but seven of these institutions are state-supported, the others being financed through private or municipal funds. Twenty-three are state universities (*universita*) and are located in the following cities: Bari, Bologna, Cagliari (Sardinia), Catania (Sicily), Ferrara, Florence, Genoa, Macerata, Messina (Sicily), Milan, Modena, Naples,

Padua, Palermo (Sicily), Parma, Pavia, Perugia, Pisa, Rome, Sassari (Sardinia), Siena, Turin, and Trieste. There are also four private or "free universities" of Camerino, Urbino, the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart of Milan, and the Luigi Bocconi University of Economics and Commerce of Milan. The four higher institutes (*istituti superiori*) are those of Economics and Commerce of Venice, Architecture of Venice, the Polytechnic of Milan, and the Polytechnic of Turin. Three special institutes are the Higher Oriental Institute of Naples, the Higher Naval Institute of Naples, and the Higher Normal School of Pisa. Finally, there are five higher institutes of education (*istituti superiori di magistero*): Suor Orsola Benincasa of Naples, St. Mary of the Assumption of Rome, and those of Genoa, Salerno, and Catania. The government also operates a University for Foreigners at Perugia. Outside the scope of our consideration are a number of schools of fine arts, industrial arts, music, and other special studies which do not have university status.

This would seem to be an excessive number of universities for a country with the geographical limitations of Italy, especially when one considers the fact that a number of institutions have as few as one or two faculties or institutes, and, indeed, Italian professional associations have voiced strong protests against both the founding of any more universities and the inclusion of any new faculties. They would instead expand the facilities of existing institutions and give attention to completing faculties in those geographical regions, such as in the south of Italy and in Sardinia, where they are lacking. However, local pride and purpose run very strong, and even now there are several new private universities seeking recognition, e.g., University of the Abruzzi, Free University of Psycho-Biophysics of Trieste, and the International University of Social Studies of Rome.

One notes, too, the profusion of institutions in the north of Italy, traditionally the wealthiest and most cultivated section of the country, and the comparative lack of them in the southern part of the peninsula. There are, in fact, only four university cities with 34 faculties in the south, as compared with 18 cities and 137 faculties in the north. Moreover, there are enrolled more than three times as many students per faculty in the south as in the

north. In truth, the argument for doing something more for the poverty-ridden and illiterate south is strong, but the financial burden on the state is already nigh overwhelming. The granting of considerably more scholarships to southern Italian students might provide temporary relief.

The supervising body governing all universities in Italy is the Superior Council of Public Instruction, consisting of professors elected by the various academic faculties to represent them in the Ministry. The Superior Council has final authority in all administrative and instructional matters affecting the universities, and acts as an advisory board of experts to the Minister of Public Instruction. Each university is headed by a *rettore* (rector), or *direttore* (director) in the case of an institute, who is elected for a three-year term by the *corpo accademico* (academic council) composed of all the "official professors" of the institution and presided over by the senior professor. The *senato accademico* (academic senate) comprises the rector or director and the *presidi* (deans) of the various faculties which constitute the university or institute. Most of the detailed operations of the university are handled by the academic senate: budgets, schedules, awards, discipline, and so on. Faculty deans are elected for three-year terms by the faculty council, consisting of the official professors of the particular school. Each faculty council plans its own courses, assigns instructional duties, and counsels students registered in the faculty. Finally, there is a *consiglio di amministrazione* (administrative council) for each university, constituted by decree of the Minister for an academic biennium and composed of the rector or director, three official professors elected by the faculty deans, two representatives of the government, the administrative director of the university (who acts as business manager and is really the only continuing university official), and three provincial representatives delegated by the associations of agriculture, industry and commerce, and the city, respectively, in which the institution is located. This council deals primarily with matters involving finance and the physical plant of the university.

It will be noticed that the organization of the Italian university confers on the individual professor an importance and an influence seldom known to his American colleagues. The professor is the

backbone, if not the sole force, in every administrative body from the Superior Council down to the faculty committee. The phenomenon of the "professional administrator" is unknown in Italy, and any move to make permanent positions out of administrative offices would be viewed with considerable alarm. Therefore, there is never that sharp line drawn between "faculty" and "administration" that is too often the grief of our own institutions.

In spite of a considerable degree of local autonomy practiced by the universities, it should be recognized that legal control still resides in the state, and an authoritarian government could still employ the discretionary powers of the Minister of Public Instruction, as happened once during Fascism. But there does not seem to be much objection to this danger in Italy, perhaps because there are many who still feel that Fascism did more to improve the universities than to harm them.

Instruction in the universities is given in 17 different faculties or institutes: law; letters and philosophy; political and social sciences; medicine and surgery; engineering; mining engineering; mathematical, physical and natural sciences; industrial chemistry; pharmacy; veterinary medicine; agriculture; economics and commerce; statistical and actuarial sciences; architecture; education; oriental studies; and nautical studies. The number of faculties comprising any one university varies with its size and purpose: Rome has as many as 11 faculties; Macerata has only one (law), as do the several higher institutes of education. Courses in all faculties last for four years except those of chemistry, engineering, and architecture, which cover five years, and that of medicine and surgery, which is of six years' duration. Attached also to some universities are special schools, usually of one to three years' duration, for librarians and archivists, statisticians, musicologists, and aeronautical engineers.

A single faculty usually offers one or two degree programs, but there are some which offer as many as seven or eight. In general, the *laurea* is awarded in courses lasting four or more years; the *diploma* is granted in special schools or courses of shorter duration.

V

University faculties enjoy considerable autonomy in Italy. The lack of a central campus, the scattering of buildings and equipment,

old and honorable traditions, and a highly specialized curriculum have all contributed to the formation of strong individual faculties within the loosely-knit universities. There is no homogeneity, however, within the individual faculties; faculty strength lies wholly in the individual professors, who often have little or no personal contact with their colleagues. Faculties, moreover, are frequently housed in buildings whose exterior appearance, at least, is the antithesis of the elegant new façades that we proudly display on the American campus. But sometimes the patina of antiquity will conceal a colorful Renaissance hall, a delightful courtyard, or even ultra-modern classrooms and laboratories within.

Faculty personnel are normally recruited by means of competitive examinations, which are requested by the university having a vacant chair, and are announced by the Ministry. Every year the official professors of each subject taught in the universities and institutes elect an examining commission of five professors to judge the qualifications of the competitors seeking university posts in that particular subject. After each competition—which consists of reviewing the publications submitted by the candidates, questioning them orally, and perhaps even hearing them present a lecture—the examiners select the three best candidates, who constitute a *terna*. The top candidate has the right to occupy the chair placed in competition, while the remaining candidates of the *terna* can be called later to fill other chairs of the subject which may become vacant. Although there is considerable criticism concerning the method by which examining committees are constituted and the dangers of favoritism and external pressure in the selection of candidates, the Italians have not as yet found a better way to staff university faculties.

Eminent official professors of one university may also be called to fill a vacancy in another university without participating in a competitive examination. In such cases, the Ministry of Public Instruction must approve the transfer.

Official instruction (*i.e.*, instruction in officially established courses) in the universities is carried on by *professori di ruolo* (official professors) and *professori incaricati* (professors-in-charge). All professors nominated to a university position through a competitive examination become “official professors” and are desig-

nated *professori straordinari* for three years, after which, if their scholarly and teaching activities are deemed satisfactory, they are promoted to the rank of *professore ordinario*. The latter rank carries with it continuous tenure. *Professori incaricati* are designated from year to year by each university, which assigns to them certain teaching duties. These professors-in-charge are usually young *liberi docenti* (cf. the German *Privatdozent* and the French *agrégé*), who have not as yet won a competition for a university chair.

Private courses which do not duplicate the official courses of the university may be taught by certain qualified people. That is, *liberi docenti* of a university have the legal right to hold courses in certain disciplines without receiving remuneration other than the tuition paid by their students. University statutes determine the criteria by which private courses may be recognized, admission requirements, and the academic credit they may carry.

The *libera docenza* in Italy, an academic recognition roughly corresponding to the American Ph.D., is good only to qualify a person for an *incaricato* position and, strictly speaking, is not even a necessary title or prerequisite for a university chair. But the problem of recognizing *liberi docenti* has been a vexing one in Italy for many years. For one thing, there has always been in certain faculties a surplus of teachers who have attained this title. Moreover, many professional people, especially in the fields of law and medicine, desire a nominal teaching position in the university chiefly for the purpose of enhancing a professional reputation. It is said, for example, that a physician who can claim to be *libero docente nell'università* can also claim proportionately higher fees for his professional services. Law faculties in Italy have gained a bad reputation because of the loose connection the *liberi docenti* have with the law schools. The Gentile Reform of 1923 and the School Reform of 1949 have established increasingly rigorous qualifications for the conferring of the *libero docente*. Severe restrictions relative to academic qualifications, age, examinations and re-examinations, privileges, and tenure are enforced today.

In 1953 there were 1572 official professors, 4098 professors-in-charge, and 6465 private teachers in all the Italian universities. It is a lamentable fact that more than two-thirds of official university instruction is carried on by *professori incaricati*, who are de-

moralized by both the insecurity of their positions and the fact that they receive less than half the salary of a *professore di ruolo*. By limiting the number of official posts in the universities the state may save money for instructional salaries. But it is unwise economy, in that most *incaricati* are forced to work at part-time jobs or to teach in several institutions in order to earn a living wage. It is more difficult to estimate the importance of private teachers, since their number varies considerably from faculty to faculty and their teaching varies from a full load to a few lectures a year by those who are mainly interested in fulfilling this requirement in order to retain their university affiliation.

Attached also to each university faculty are a number of *assistenti* (assistants) who help the official professors with examinations, exercises, laboratory work, research, and other academic activity. Some assistants are paid a stipend by the university; others work through a purely voluntary arrangement. In the field of medicine many assistants do their internship, build up a practice, or prepare for state examinations in this manner. In other faculties, young graduates may work as assistants while awaiting a vacancy in their field.

The career of an aspirant to a university chair is a long, arduous and highly competitive one. Typically, the young university graduate applies for a *supplenza* (temporary or substitute appointment) in a secondary school. The initial teaching post is usually in a small town, and after several years' experience the teacher may find a place in a large city. Meanwhile, he prepares himself for a *concorso* (competitive examination) in his field, normally held every two years, through which he may win a permanent position. But his main object is to gain a scholarly reputation through the publication of as many articles and books as possible. His publications and academic qualifications will then be judged in a national noncompetitive examination for the *libera docenza* by a committee of university professors in his field. Winning the *libera docenza* makes the teacher eligible for a temporary university post as *professore incaricato*, which he may try to obtain instead of, or in addition to, his secondary school appointment. Finally, he will enter a *concorso* for a university chair, in the manner previously described, and, if successful, will at last make an official university connection.

Professors who attain particular distinction as scholars may make a final move by transfer to one of the more distinguished universities of Italy, e.g., Florence, Rome, Pisa, Bologna.

VI

Admission to Italian universities is granted to students holding either the diploma of *maturità classica* given by the *liceo classico* or the diploma of *maturità scientifica* granted by the *liceo scientifico*. State examinations of "maturity" are administered after 13 years of schooling (five elementary, three intermediate, five secondary) by a commission appointed by the Provincial Superintendent of Schools. The examinations are comprehensive in scope, covering all subjects studied, and winners of a diploma from an Italian *liceo* may, in general, be said to have the equivalent instruction offered through two years of the American college. The classical diploma will admit a student to any university faculty; the scientific diploma will admit him to any faculty except those of letters, law, and education.

Graduates from the secondary teachers' institutes are admitted after an entrance examination only to the faculty or higher institute of education. Graduates of technical institutes are admitted to faculties of economics, commerce, and statistics, and to the Nautical Institute of Naples. Likewise, graduates from institutes of agriculture are admitted to the faculty of agriculture. Finally, graduates from the *liceo artistico* are admitted to the faculty of architecture and to the academies of fine arts.

The specialized function of university faculties leaves no place for general education or "basic college" work as it is known in America. It is assumed that a broad education in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences is attained in the last two years of the *liceo*. It is also assumed that university students are mature, responsible, self-sufficient citizens of the state. Italian students, therefore, are left much to their own resources in planning the sequence of their courses and in meeting the degree requirements in their particular faculty. There is no real counselling and comparatively little personal contact between teachers and students. Classroom instruction is carried on in a highly impersonal manner; and inasmuch as the professors seldom know even the names of

their students, a strictly professional relationship is observed at all times.

Since the degree program is based largely upon the student's ability to pass a number of examinations, it matters little—except in the case of prerequisites—when the student takes his courses or even whether he attends classes. Each student has a registration book containing his photograph and matriculation data. After a course examination is taken, the professor signs the book and enters a grade theoretically attesting the attendance, diligence, and attainment of the student in his course. The professor and the secretary of the faculty keep copies of the student's grades in course and that is about all the bookkeeping done.

Although there are usually both a written and an oral examination in each course, the oral examination is considerably more important. In many faculties written work is suspect and is avoided; it is the question-and-answer session between professor and student that really counts. This is because there is said to be widespread cheating on written examinations and in written assignments. Moreover, students cannot be expelled for cheating; they can only be failed in the course. In order to expel a student from the university a professor must sue him in a legal process, and, of course, this is seldom done. The difficulty of inculcating an *esprit de corps* which would make an "honor system" possible in non-residential universities is obvious.

Student associations have never flourished in Italy. The universities are not residential, having no campuses or dormitories as we know them in America. Only the Higher Normal School of Pisa and the Benincasa Higher Institute of Education provide living quarters for most of their students. The typical university student lives either at home with his family or in a private *pensione*. The only real contact students have with the university administration is through their elected representatives in the *interfacoltà*, which has the function of making known to the Ministry and to the academic authorities the needs and aspirations of the students. "Goliardic" associations may sponsor a "cineclub" and a series of dances during the year. But the profusion of extra-curricular activities that crowd American college life—sports, fraternities, publications, dramatics, debating, and so on—is virtually unknown.

The need for closer student association has been recognized in Italy for some time, and in recent years much progress has been made in establishing student dining halls and student houses. In some institutions modern "colleges" have been founded, such as the "Collegio Cairoli" of the University of Pavia, opened since the last war in a modernized building housing 100 students, or the three colleges of the Catholic University of Milan housing young men, young women, and clerical students respectively. In most cases, however, the student houses and "colleges" are reserved for needy students or foreign students, and there is still no place for the tens of thousands of students who would like to live in a university establishment.

In that university students in Italy are notably more mature than their counterparts in America, having entered the university a year or two older and with richer academic backgrounds, decentralized living conditions are not the important factor they would be in our own country. But youth is still impetuous and will not be denied. Since there are no well-organized programs of sports and student activities in the universities to dissipate excess energy, Italian students—and, indeed, European students generally—have a notable history of political agitation and rioting. Mob action may take the form either of strikes or of burning in effigy the *magnifico rettore* for disallowing a special session of examinations or of marching on a foreign consulate, as happened in numerous Italian cities during the Trieste demonstrations of 1953. It has been said in levity that Italian students study the 3 R's—reading, rioting, and 'rithmetic—and one notes in sorrow how often passions are vented in mass demonstrations. Since historically the Italian university is a *universitas scholarium* rather than a *universitas magistrorum*, students are theoretically inviolate by the law. Even today police cannot quell disturbances on university property without sanction of the rector.

One observes, too, an alarming growth of neo-Fascism among students—who actually remember nothing of Mussolini's twenty years—which is cloaked under the guise of patriotism. It is perhaps less surprising to find a great many active communists among Italy's young intellectuals. Age grouping, the spirit of camaraderie, the gregarious instinct—call it what you will—which brings students

together in common interest and activity needs to be much better directed in Italy.

VII

Instruction in Italian universities is organized on the basis of an academic year with classes meeting for an hour three or four times a week for one or more years. The academic year begins on November 1 and ends October 31, although classes actually end about the first of June. Two regular sessions of examinations are scheduled each year, one in late June or July and the other about the first of October. A student may take an examination whenever he feels himself prepared; it need not be taken immediately after the completion of the course. Full-time students generally take six or seven examinations in one academic year.

There is only one academic diploma or title awarded by Italian universities, the *laurea*, although a few faculties and institutes award a *diploma* of equal status. The *laurea* is the approximate equivalent of the master of arts or master of science degree in America, except in the case of the *laurea* in medicine and surgery, which is comparable to the American M.D. The academic title of "doctor" is assumed by all degree holders.

Before the Gentile Reform the *laurea* in itself was sufficient title to practice a profession in Italy. Now, however, state examinations, to insure equality of instruction, thoroughness of preparation, and impartiality of treatment, are prescribed for entrance into all professions.

For the degree the student must theoretically register for, attend, and pass examinations in a determined number of courses, usually totalling about 24. Each faculty, however, is free to enforce the attendance regulation as it sees fit. The courses in each faculty or institute leading to a degree are divided into *insegnamenti fondamentali* (required courses) and *insegnamenti complementari* (elective courses). The required courses are established by law and are standard in all universities offering the same degree. The specific subject matter and point of view presented are left to the discretion of the professors. Elective courses are also standard, but vary in number according to the size of the university and faculty. Irregular or indulgent attitudes toward attendance regulations and

examination standards are most likely to develop in elective courses where professors sometimes have to compete with one another for students. Students, even in Italy, tend to take the easy way out whenever possible. One may find, in this connection, such a situation as exists in the Faculty of Letters of the University of Rome, where there are seven times more students studying Hebrew than English because they think the grammar is easier. There has been a tendency in recent years to increase the number of required courses and reduce the number of electives in order to make the curricula more uniform and difficult.

In most faculties a written thesis is also required for the degree, and this thesis must be defended in an oral examination before a committee of professors. Furthermore, the degree candidate is required to discuss two or three topics relative to his field but different from the thesis, and to answer questions directed to him by the committee.

Much criticism, however, has been directed at the utility and value of the thesis, which, indeed, is often a superficial piece of research and a great expense to the student. Arguments were heard during the School Reform for abolishing the thesis in favor of seminars, where specialized knowledge can be integrated and synthesized through discussions and exercises, or in favor of written examinations of such quality as to make state examinations for professional practice unnecessary.

Corollary to the problem of the thesis is the problem of the duplicate function of the university in Italy in preparing students either for professions or for careers in scientific or scholarly research. The Ministry of Public Instruction has recently suggested that courses should lead to the conferring of a doctoral diploma in place of the *laurea*. These courses would then be followed either by the *scuola di perfezionamento scientifico* (graduate school) of two years' duration, conferring a *laurea scientifica*, or by the *scuola di applicazione professionale* (professional school) of at least one year, which would prepare for the state professional examinations. (The term *scientifico* in Italy means both "scientific" and "scholarly," and would here include students preparing for teaching careers.) The *laurea scientifica* would, in this event, include a published thesis. However, Italian faculties are split at the moment over accepting this

proposal. Meanwhile, in spite of considerable sentiment in favor of abolishing the thesis, it remains one of the chief hurdles to the degree in most faculties.

As in the rest of Europe, there are no well-organized university graduate schools in Italy. Indeed, graduate education is peculiar to the university systems of England and America, where, in the case of our own country, graduate schools have taken during the twentieth century a leading rôle in our system of higher education. The post-Napoleonic university systems of France, Italy, and Germany, superimposed on secondary lyceums and gymnasiums, are highly specialized in their programs and are not comparable to the American or English "college." Their function, if not their level and method of instruction, is the same as our graduate schools. Beyond the regular university courses in Italy, there are numerous *scuole di perfezionamento* and advanced institutes attached to the universities, where graduate students can do specialized and independent study in subject-matter areas. But they can hardly be called "graduate schools" in the sense of having a well-defined organization and a full catalogue of courses separate from regular faculty offerings. Certificates may be awarded for the work done, but no advanced degrees are conferred in Italy beyond the *laurea*. There is a tendency to take the terms *studente* and *dottore* literally, and it would be unthinkable to some Italians to consider themselves "students" of a subject after taking the *laurea*. As a result, progressive Italians today manifest an increasing desire to avail themselves of the vast resources of American universities for the highest level of instruction, especially in fields of science and technology.

Library facilities in Italian universities are shocking to the American observer. Not only are resources poor, especially in current acquisitions, but they are also inaccessible because of archaic cataloguing and inefficient systems of circulation. Some libraries are rich in manuscripts, incunabula, and periodicals, but these are very difficult for the student to get at and study efficiently. There is little concept of library services in Italy; comfortable and well-lighted reading rooms, the so-called "tools" of library research, open shelves, and well-trained and available librarians familiar to even the smallest college libraries in the United States are virtually

unknown in Italy. Consequently, library facilities are not generally used effectively or to capacity. The story is told among American scholars in Italy of how one of their number approached the *bibliotecario* of a venerable institution and asked if he might look over the library's resources. "But no," replied the old gentleman, leading the American down a dark corridor past tiers of musty wire-encased shelves, "for our holdings are incomplete. You must come back next week after I get back the book someone borrowed from that shelf over there." The anecdote probably is not true, but it offers some insight, nevertheless, into the situation that prevails. Most universities spend considerably less than \$10,000 annually on acquisitions, and with such meager financial support the future of Italian libraries as research centers is indeed precarious.

Essential scientific equipment in the universities is slightly more impressive, for, while laboratories are often crowded and overworked, facilities for research seem to be available. Private industries and Marshall Plan aid have done much to rehabilitate medical, engineering, and technical faculties since the war. Regular university funds are also augmented from time to time by grants from the National Council for Research, for the purpose of encouraging scientific activity. But what Italian scientists lack in resources, they seem to make up for in imagination and ingenuity. One need only recall that it was Enrico Fermi, Franco Rasetti, Bruno Pontecorvo, and other professors at the University of Rome who first patented experiments in atomic fission and thermonuclear fusion which American scientists developed later into the atomic and hydrogen bombs.

VIII

The principal method of university instruction in Italy is the lecture (*lezione*). Professors usually enter the classroom, lecture on the subject for the day, assign a bibliography, and leave promptly at the end of the class hour. There is little or no personal contact between professor and student until the end of the course, when the professor must evaluate the examination. Although the student may arrange a consultation with the professor for individual help, the burden of the educative process is on the student. The student may resort to any means to master the subject-matter of the

course. The use of printed *dispense* (abstracts) of lectures and other pertinent material in preparing for a course examination is widely tolerated, in spite of frequent attacks on such an obvious process of rote learning.

University professors generally teach one course, which meets for three or four hours a week during the academic year. (American professors who have 9, 12, or 15 hour schedules may well understand why their European colleagues are able to accumulate phenomenal bibliographies.) Whether the course lasts for one or four years, the object is not to make a survey of the subject—such as a study of Western philosophy from Plato to Croce—but to teach a “method” of inquiry through lectures on selected specialized subjects. A year’s course in English literature, for example, might be devoted to a study of John Keats. The professor’s current research activity on a special topic in his field might well be the essence of his course for that particular year. Unfortunately, it is perhaps equally true that professors give a *corso monografico* in order to sell students their book on the specialized subject. But the concept of academic freedom is taken seriously in Italy, and professors jealously guard their right to select the subject matter and the method of their course as they see fit. Faculties of letters have even been known to repel the mildly limiting proposal that there might be intra-faculty cooperation in offering a chronological sequence of courses in history, literature, art, and philosophy.

Contributing to the professor’s detachment from everything except his immediate course of lectures is the fact that faculty members are not required to reside in the cities where they teach. Professors in the universities of Naples and Venice, for example, may have their homes in Rome, and professors in the smaller provincial universities almost always live in a large city, perhaps hundreds of miles away. There are even examples of professors in Sicilian universities who live as far north on the mainland as Genoa. Under such conditions it is no wonder that a professor’s interest in his students and his university seldom extends beyond the classroom and the lecture for the day.

University professors also spend a considerable amount of time administering examinations, not only in their own institutions but also in connection with competitions sponsored by the state for

secondary school and university posts. Professors of each academic subject, for example, have a committee which examines and selects candidates for vacancies in their field in the secondary schools—a system which we might well consider in the United States. Such competitions may take a professor away from his teaching for a month or more at a time; and inasmuch as most competitions are held in Rome, the professor's relationship with his own university becomes even more remote.

Instead of, or sometimes in addition to, their regular course of lectures, some professors hold "seminars" for advanced students, in which some degree of informality and intimacy can be achieved. There is often an enthusiastic response on the part of students to the discussion and criticism relevant to individual reports and research projects. Of special interest until his untimely death were the seminars of the famous classicist Giorgio Pasquale of the University of Pisa, which began when his students met him at the railroad station and continued in discussion through the streets until he reached the university hall. But such stimulating teachers seem to be everywhere the exception rather than the rule. Moreover, the overcrowding of most faculties makes the seminar method of instruction impracticable.

The recent School Reform has clearly cited the need for more practical rather than theoretical instruction and for direct contact between teacher and pupil. The *libertà* implicit in the new university can only be effected when the mentality and personality of the student are stimulated through direct participation with the professor in the work at hand. Advocates of the *esercitazione* (exercise and discussion) method of instruction come mainly from students preparing for professional rather than scholarly careers.

The prevalence of the *lezione* has no doubt contributed to the problem of nonattendance at classes in the universities. Thirty-six per cent of all Italian university students are registered *fuori corso*, i.e., they may take examinations, but do not attend classes regularly; and this number may run as high as 73% in certain faculties, such as that of engineering at the University of Genoa, or as high as 84% in certain schools, such as the Higher Institute of Education of Salerno. University halls are crowded during the examination sessions because many students who must work to

pay their expenses register *fuori corso* (outside regular classes) and attend only for the purpose of taking the examinations. Cases have been frequently cited where students have prepared for examinations by committing to memory abstracted material without ever having attended classes. The School Reform has, therefore, advocated stricter attendance regulations by the faculties in order to combat student passivity. However, in the faculties of letters, law, economics, education, and political and social sciences attendance is still only theoretically compulsory. In schools such as the small residential teachers' institute Benincasa of Naples or the Higher Normal School of Pisa, where all the students have scholarships, or the Catholic University of Milan, where there is strict local faculty control, attendance is no problem. But in the greater number of universities, a student's academic progress is measured wholly in terms of his ability to pass examinations.

IX

Most of the critical problems of higher education in Italy are related directly or indirectly to university financing. Italian economy being what it is today, most institutions of higher learning must support themselves largely from revenues derived from private sources: tuition and fees, investments, funds allocated by the province and city, and contributions from the local chamber of commerce and industry. The amount of state aid is determined by a number of factors, such as the size of the institution, the number and types of faculties (medical and engineering schools, for example, are maintained at great expense), and the particular demands for student assistance. Thus, the government makes a comparatively modest contribution in the case of the University of Florence, while it wholly subsidizes the Higher Normal School of Pisa. Private institutions do not receive a government subsidy.

Recently, several institutions have made strong appeals to local industry and private individuals for funds to alleviate operating deficits. Milanese business men and industrialists, in their determination to make their city the most modern and progressive in Italy, have been particularly generous to the institutions located there. Italy's largest chemical industry, Montecatini, alone spon-

sors 20 annual scholarships of about \$500 each for students in industrial chemistry at the polytechnic institute. In Florence, the local chamber of commerce recently equipped a laboratory for the faculty of agriculture and provided funds for an additional teaching position in the faculty of law.

But in spite of such fine examples, which are worthy of widespread imitation, the fact remains that for the past 25 years there has been an increasing measure of government support of the universities. Those who oppose the recognition of any new universities cite the pattern whereby an institution usually begins under private auspices and ends up with a government subsidy. In truth, the need in Italy today is not for more, but for fewer universities, more strategically located and better adapted to expansion and modification.

There were over 225,000 students undertaking higher education in Italy in 1953-54. The universities of Rome, Naples, and Milan enrolled 15%, 13%, and 11%, respectively, of this number. Student population is overwhelming for the facilities available, and the situation is much worse than the comparable overcrowding of American universities that occurred immediately after the last war. Faculties registering the greatest number of students are those of law, medicine, mathematics, economics, engineering, chemistry, and letters. Overcrowding is especially a problem in the south of Italy where, in spite of a higher illiteracy rate in this section, proportionately more students attend the universities than do in the north. A system of *sbarramenti* (elimination examinations) proposed during the School Reform has been widely discussed. They would include admission examinations to the universities, presumably highly selective in character, and a series of tests or other criteria calculated to eliminate, after the first year or two of courses, students who have not demonstrated a capacity for higher education. These would approximate the complicated system of "indexes" and "class standing" that is common in American institutions. The Ministry of Public Instruction is also studying ways by which the state examinations of maturity might be more accurately and fairly administered so as to become a better index of a student's ability to follow higher education.

Until something can be done either to reduce student population

or to provide greatly expanded facilities, Italian universities must continue to be essentially examining rather than instructional institutions. While university students have increased during the past 20 years by 359%, the number of official professors has been augmented by only 17% and that of *incaricati* by only 78%. A professor of Italian has calculated that if he devoted only 10 minutes to examining each of his 2000 students a year, he could do nothing else but conduct examinations. Many professors, moreover, must read between 100 and 200 theses a year, and participate in as many thesis examinations. Some of this work is delegated by the official professors to their assistants; but under such conditions all the evils of superficiality and unfairness inherent in examinations are greatly multiplied. One can only observe that there would seem to be a need for a system of strict written examinations, insuring both thorough coverage and impartiality, to replace the brief oral examinations current in the universities.

Since the Constitution guarantees to capable students the right to higher education, it has been necessary for the government to expand greatly the program of scholarship aid. Italian students are notoriously poor. In some universities, as many as 60% of the students have either full-time or part-time jobs. Consequently, it has been necessary to provide more and more money for scholarships in order to alleviate such sacrifices. The relationship between tuition rates and total university revenue remains a delicate one: on the one hand, universities are principally dependent on student fees, and on the other, students react violently against any attempt to raise them.

Perhaps the chief problem of postwar higher education in Italy has been the moral, economic, and social rehabilitation of university professors. Until the past year or two, it was practically impossible for a professor to live on his university income alone. It was common practice for professors either to practice a profession on the side or to work at part-time jobs. Consequently, teaching duties sometimes were neglected or put aside for other work; in some cases, the university position definitely took second place to the private practice of law, medicine, or engineering. Such a situation, moreover, contributed nothing to the need for closer contact between teacher and student in the universities. As long as

his economic plight prevented him from making teaching his principal mission and occupation in life, the professor could not devote the time and the effort to his work that students demanded.

Deprived of the dignity of a reasonable professional and economic status, professors sometimes sold published *dispense* of their courses, which often took the place of regular class meetings. Other university "scandals" were discovered and fully reported in professional journals. In all fairness, however, it must be said that cases of professional laxity are generally flagrantly exposed in Italy; anyone could probably find comparable practices in the United States about which, publicly at least, nothing is said.

Clearly, something drastic had to be done in order to confer on the profession the dignity and social respect it deserves. In 1950 the Associazione Nazionale dei Professori Universitari di Ruolo (ANPUR), the very active "AAUP" of Italy, to which all official professors belong, began a concerted campaign to improve the professional and economic status of its members. Its program advocated the raising of both state contributions and tuition, a re-evaluation of the state salary schedule for professors, the legal recognition of the separate professional and economic status of university professors (such as had just been accorded to state magistrates), compensation for extra hours of work, and the raising of the retirement age for professors from 70 to 75. A dramatic and energetic fight against public apathy and legislative delays ensued which threatened at one point a "strike," or abstention from participating in an examination session. Passage of the so-called Ermini laws of December, 1951, provided a rather unsatisfactory compromise. The professors received an increase in salary, to be financed from increased student fees, and an extension of the retirement age-limit. However, university professors remain in the same classification as regular state employees, although higher grades in the civil service system are now open to them. By American standards, salaries are still fantastically low: most official professors earn between \$1,500 and \$2,000 annually, and professors-in-charge less than half that amount. In order to advance himself economically the university professor is still forced to take on teaching duties in two or three different institutions or to rely on other part-time work. Loyalty to one university is not

required in Italy, where professors are employees of the state rather than of any particular institution.

But in spite of his financial plight, the professor's social status in Italy remains high. He is everywhere honored and respected. The Italian's instinctive admiration for qualities of intellect has made of the professor a much more sympathetic figure than lawyers and physicians, who are traditionally mistrusted. It is gratifying to observe, too, the very important rôle former university professors play in Italian political life as prime ministers, cabinet members, senators, party leaders, mayors, and so on. In fact, one might hazard the diagnosis that the trouble with Italy is that there are *too many* capable leaders and not enough followers willing to co-operate with them!

X

The Ministry of Public Instruction has indicated that it will not try to do much more than preserve the *status quo* of higher education during the present period of unstable government and uncertain financial outlook. It is unfortunate that the ambitious School Reform of 1949 failed to make clear to Italian educators what is to be the rôle and function—theoretically, if not practically—of the university in the new Republic. Some fundamental questions, which in part the Reform attempted to answer, have not crystallized yet as basic considerations in the thinking of those concerned with the schools. Is the Italian university to continue its traditional rôle of forming a *classe dirigente* (leader caste), or should it attempt to implement the aims of the Constitution, which declares that the state will make higher education available to all capable citizens? Are the universities to continue to dump hordes of professional people, scientists, technologists, and intellectuals into an impoverished society which cannot absorb them? Moreover, what is the relationship between these two problems? Finally, are the universities to continue as primarily lecturing and examining bodies, devoid of other implications of the educative process?

The relationship between the problems of the function and the overcrowding of the universities is not generally understood. One sees, for example, frequent polemics against the large number of

students registered *fuori corso*. Indeed, more than one-third of all university students in Italy are students "outside of course," who, having finished a certain portion of their work, attend the university only to take examinations in the remaining portion. These students have been called "parasites of the university," "nibblers of education," and "good-for-nothings," and the universities with large numbers of such students have been attacked as "inefficient," "useless," and "damaging." It may be true that some students are not capable, serious, and persevering, and should be permanently separated from the university; but other students simply cannot afford the expense of four or more continuous years at a university, and must interrupt their studies with periods of work. No university in America is particularly ashamed of its "special" or "extension" students, but in Italy the idea that the university should be the nurturing ground of a special, if not privileged, class still prevails. The belief that the university must cater to an intellectual elite is difficult to reconcile with the constitutional ideal that higher education must be open to all who are meritorious and capable. It is sad to relate also that the government's effort, through the Ermini laws of 1951, to provide scholarships and other scholastic assistance, seems to have reached too few students. In short, the Constitution still promises more than it has accomplished, while at the same time complex and fundamental problems of university ordination remain unresolved.

The didactic function of the university was thoroughly discussed during the Reform and would seem to be capable of more immediate application. Although some faculties and a few universities try to regulate class attendance, the examination is still the dominant academic yardstick in Italy. What the student does in or out of the classroom or between the two annual examination periods, how or how much he studies, where he lives, the state of his health and well-being, his social life and habits, are of little concern to the university. Since examinations hold the place of utmost importance in the life of the university, one would assume that they are administered with a similar degree of fairness and impartiality. Such, however, does not seem always to be the case. An oral examination is the basis of both course and degree examinations; but although a written examination would seem to offer a more

thorough and objective measurement, the argument is that the former is quicker and eliminates the factor of cheating. It is not an exaggeration to say that the oral examination has been overworked in Italy, and that such examination sessions are sometimes influenced by factors of temperament and caprice. An oral examination may degenerate into nothing more than a quiz session, when students are asked such questions as: What plays did Poe write? Who was the wife of the English Charles II? In what year did Italy have its most favorable balance of trade? If the examination must continue to be the only measurement of academic growth in the universities, the possibility of establishing a system of carefully planned, impartially administered, and judiciously graded written examinations should certainly be explored in all faculties.

In conclusion, it may not be ungracious to state that this study of Italian universities has provided the writer with a much keener appreciation of higher education in his own country. The immense resources that our rich and progressive country has marshalled in the name of education are truly amazing, and it seems to the European that here, as in everything, America must always raise a club to brain a gnat. Oddly enough, too, we begin to see more clearly our own faults and virtues from the perspective of the faults and virtues of others. Perhaps our great wealth has indeed lulled us into educating by means of the rolling campus and the grand façade. Our students often come to college illiterate, and sometimes we send them away, capped and gowned, still illiterate. We do seem fascinated so much by the novel and the peripheral that we often lose sight of the fundamental. We are like Shakespeare's Jacques, always off on a new scent. Perhaps we have as much to learn from Europe as the "old country" has been trying to learn from us. If, as Rilke said of poetry, nothing can do so little for it as criticism, nothing can do more to advance the cause of education everywhere than continued inquiry, discussion, and exchange of ideas with educators of all countries.

THE TUTORIAL SYSTEM¹

By WILLIAM S. ROUVEROL

University of California

The comparative importance of the private tutor in European education can perhaps be attributed to the particular social function served by the European university. Unlike its American counterpart, the European university exists almost exclusively for two fairly well-defined purposes: first, to train outstanding scholars and researchers, and second, to fill the needs of the professional fields—law, medicine, engineering, etc. Varying emphasis may of course be placed on one or the other of these objectives; German universities, for example, have traditionally stressed the first aim, whereas the British, with a few noteworthy exceptions, have given greater attention to the second.

These underlying purposes have naturally been reflected in all aspects of university organization and teaching policy, and particularly in examination procedures. Not only do examinations impose a "day of judgment" on the student; they serve equally well as a measure of what is being endeavored by the university itself. Candidates for European bachelor's degrees, for example, must pass an examination of a scope and difficulty exceeding even that of the comprehensives taken by American graduate students or professional licensees in law, medicine, and engineering. The design in both cases is, significantly, the same: to demand of scholars or professionals a working knowledge of an entire field.

The magnitude of the ordinary first degree examination in Europe, which may run for as many as forty or fifty hours during the course of eight or ten consecutive days, is such as to pose a formidable challenge even to the far-from-casual European student. So much hinges on performance in this one ordeal that many students seek special assistance in preparation for it, and as a result

¹ Published also in the *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, January, 1955.

a sizable coterie of private tutors is to be found in the vicinity of nearly every European university. The amount of tutorial coaching varies greatly at different universities, but wherever a large number of students can afford it the system thrives. During the past century private tutoring in fact reached such proportions at certain British universities that in order to put all students on an equal footing and to control what had become a major element in instruction, several university administrations took a step of major significance in educational history: the tutors were officially incorporated into the university instructional program. Every Oxford and Cambridge student is now assigned to a faculty member for regular tutoring, and nearly all faculty members devote as much time to their several tutorial pupils as to either lecturing or research. A system that originated as a crutch for the weaker students has thus evolved into a major vehicle of instruction, fully as important as the lecture program.

This sort of development could never have occurred spontaneously at an American university, for the reason that the particular social function served by the American university has impeded rather than fostered the growth of tutorial teaching. The training of scholars, researchers, and professionals has in America been largely remanded to the graduate program, and the undergraduate program, in which by far the major part of university faculty and facilities are involved, is given over to an entirely different purpose, that of providing a general cultural or vocational background for as many students as possible, even though the majority will not subsequently attain a professional status. This vast program of American undergraduate training, to which there is nothing comparable on the European scene, has in effect created the American university. To compare European and American universities is to compare apples and oranges: each is essentially a product of the soil in which it has grown, and each may be convincingly justified as appropriate, both socially and economically, for its own environment.

Just as European examination procedures are indicative of the purpose and character of the European university, American methods of undergraduate examination reflect corresponding aspects of the American university. Since the majority of students

are not being trained for professional careers, mastery of an entire specialized field is not an objective, and the use of exacting comprehensive examinations at the undergraduate level is not warranted. Instead, the employment of frequent short quizzes, mid-terms, and course finals, given as much to promote day-to-day conscientiousness as to test the student's understanding, is generally accepted and approved. The amount of material covered on each of these brief examinations is so small, and the bearing of any single one on the student's total record so unimportant, that the average American student is rarely driven to seek the assistance of a private tutor. Even at the graduate level examinations are considerably less formidable than the European comprehensives. It is consequently not surprising that a flourishing extramural tutorial business has never developed in America.

II

Even though differences in the functions of American and European universities tend to make them defy comparison, each system nevertheless does serve as a rather embarrassing example for the other: the exiguity of the European program is accentuated by the vastness of the American undertaking, just as the high standards of European undergraduate training emphasize the modesty of American attainments and provide a reminder of the obstacles that American education has never been able to surmount. The American commitment to train large numbers of students inevitably creates a sort of "convoy" situation. Until he reaches graduate school, the more able American student is held to a rate of progress which is considerably slower than the pace maintained for the equivalent caliber of student in Europe, where segregation of preuniversity students for the purposes of accelerated training is the rule, and where university enrollments are restricted to a relatively select group. This difference in the rate of progress over a period of some ten years naturally produces a considerable disparity in the age at which the more highly trained American and European students reach corresponding levels of scholarly or professional competence. Law and medicine, for example, in nearly every European university are undergraduate curricula, and the

content of most curricula leading to the bachelor's degree is usually as extensive as that for the average American master's degree. By and large, the "convoy" aspect of the American educational system may be said to add from one to three years to the length of time the better students must remain in school.

The cost of this unduly protracted training, in terms of wasted talent, is far greater than is generally realized. Several of the young professional's most productive and creative years are in effect sacrificed, and much of his interest and imagination atrophied. Further, many of the most promising students abandon their studies long before they reach the level of education their abilities merit, due to impatience with their own progress or to economic inability to prolong their training into their middle twenties. These losses are well worth pondering, particularly in view of modern society's acute dependence on the skilled professional practitioner.

The retardation of the more able American student could, of course, easily be remedied by the European expedient of early segregation for the purposes of accelerated instruction. Such a solution, however, is seldom advocated by American educators, for the reason that it would be quite antithetical to American academic traditions. Although segregations based on vocation, wealth, religion, or (in some areas) race, are accepted and practiced, segregations based purely on intellectual aptitude apparently run headlong into cherished notions regarding "equality of opportunity." Even where these notions are least clearly defined or most inconsistent in application, they still seem to be healthy enough to maintain the taboo, and there are correspondingly few places in the entire educational system where aptitude-based segregations are employed, either within schools or between schools. Even at the primary level the practices of "skipping" some of the brighter students or separating them into "opportunity" classes have gradually succumbed to the educational psychologist's admonitions regarding social adjustment of children; and in states where a segregation does in fact occur between the junior colleges and the universities, the division is only a temporary one in that the way is carefully kept open for qualified junior college graduates to enter the universities at the junior year.

In the face of this vigorous tradition against segregation, the

American educator's sole remaining possibility for accelerating the training of gifted students is through increased personal attention, and his interest in tutorial teaching has grown accordingly. This interest, it should be noted, is not in the tutorial's traditional rôle as a preparation for examinations, but rather in the special potentialities of the British variant for enabling students of differing aptitude and motivation to proceed at nonuniform rates. The remarkable flexibility of the British tutorial system is evidenced in the success of Oxford and Cambridge in training some of Britain's most outstanding scholars in the briefest possible time, while simultaneously accommodating a contingent of students primarily interested in social activities. Such wide extremes of attitude are not uncommon in a university, but the success of the tutorial system in serving both without segregation of students or degrading of academic standards is most impressive. How it is accomplished will perhaps be evident from a more detailed description of its organization and operation. A few preliminary observations regarding British education as a whole may help to show the tutorial system in its proper context.

III

In Britain, the pre-university training begins very early. At the age of about eleven all British school children are given an aptitude test to determine their educational capabilities. The children with the lower scores go on to "modern secondary" and "technical" schools, corresponding to our regular and polytechnical combined junior high and high schools. Those children receiving the higher scores, on the other hand, are sent on to "grammar" or "public" schools, where they receive six or seven years of intensive preparation for university. Aside from the possibilities of injustices in a segregation at such an early age—and there are very real obstacles to gaining admission to a university from a modern secondary or technical school—the training of precollege students in Britain is carried out with remarkable efficiency. The accelerated instruction made possible by segregation carries the student through basic courses in language, history, and mathematics that in America are not scheduled until the freshman and sophomore

years of college. For example, British students entering a university to take up engineering or science have already completed a thorough course in integral calculus, normally considered in America a second-year university subject. In general, it is safe to assume that the British university entrant is academically at least a year ahead of his American counterpart.

Not all Britain's grammar and public school graduates go on to a university. Admission to the various universities, as well as the awarding of the numerous scholarships and grants, is governed by comprehensive examination, and to a lesser extent by school record. Those students who are admitted to a university elect a particular field soon after matriculation and concentrate on it almost exclusively throughout their undergraduate years. Since graduation from the university is accorded only upon the passage of a comprehensive final examination covering this single specialized field, and since the student is expected to have a well-rounded background from his precollege training, curricula generally do not include either minors or electives. The narrowness that might otherwise result from such intense specialization seems to be precluded by the atmosphere of vigorous intellectual and cultural activity prevailing in British universities. A considerable amount of broadening apparently takes place by a sort of osmotic process among the students, most of whom participate actively in a number of the music, dramatic, scientific, and literary clubs that abound at British universities.

Most British university courses are three years in length, although a few, such as chemistry, require four. The academic year includes three ten-week terms, except at Oxford and Cambridge, where the terms are only eight weeks. The total residence period for the bachelor's degree at Oxford and Cambridge is thus confined to 72 weeks—as compared to 128 weeks for the same degree at American universities. That this represents a remarkable economy in formal instruction time is underlined by the further observation that the Oxford or Cambridge bachelor's degree is comparable to the best American master's degree. Although a considerable portion of this reduction in residence time is either a legacy from superior preparatory training or attributable to the outstanding quality of the students, some portion of it must clearly

be credited to the tutorial system. The careful personal guidance provided by this system allows a maximum exploitation of the two instructional practices upon which the comparatively rapid coverage of material in European universities is based—intensive lectures and extensive outside reading.

Under the tutorial system (or, as it is called at Cambridge, “supervision”) each student is assigned to a faculty member in his major field, with whom he spends one full hour on a regular schedule each week of the term. Most of these tutorials are individual, involving only one pupil at a time, although there is some doubling up in departments where the student-faculty ratio demands it. All of the student’s outside work, except for laboratory reports, is planned and assigned by his tutor. In liberal arts fields, for example, the tutor ordinarily requires each of his students to read on a particular topic, to think about it, then write down his conclusions as an argued case in an essay of perhaps 1000 words. When the student reads this essay to his tutor the following week, the tutor discusses it from the standpoint of both content and rhetorical form—whether all of the relevant facts have been collected, whether the student has thought about the problem for himself, whether his thinking has been logical, and whether his ideas and arguments have been well expressed.

The relation of these weekly essays to the tutorial system is a fundamental one. While they would appear to be intended as a means of teaching facility in self-expression, this purpose is in reality somewhat incidental. A far more important function is that of keeping the student in an active frame of mind toward his studies. Such student occupations as listening to lectures and reading are essentially passive, and students realize little benefit from information so acquired until they must put it to some use. That we “learn by doing” has become almost a truism of modern education; but the corollary, that we learn to write by writing, is seldom appreciated in its full significance: if effective writing reflects clear thinking, then it may logically be supposed that an ability to think clearly may conversely be developed by careful training in expository writing.

In technical fields, such as mathematics, engineering, and the physical sciences, the character of the tutorial is quite different.

Essays are rarely assigned, and the weekly hour is instead devoted mainly to a review of problems the student has been assigned to work out during the preceding week or during the vacation; if the student's approach to these problems reveals any difficulty in his grasp of fundamental theory, or if he has been unable to understand points in his reading or in the lectures, the tutor undertakes to explain and clarify. Ordinarily such failures in understanding are purely individual, and the tutorial provides a framework for coping with them that wastes no one's time and allows not only a faster rate of instruction in lectures but the assignment of far more difficult outside problems without the risk of demoralizing the weaker students. A competent tutor in a technical field is able to develop in most of his students an unusual degree of thoroughness, intellectual confidence, and, above all, an ability to apply basic principles in solving abstruse and unfamiliar problems.

The cumulative effect of these weekly tutorials throughout the student's university career is far greater than the actual time involved might indicate. The friendly personal contact not only promotes a degree of conscientiousness unobtainable by alternative methods of teaching, but has a stimulating effect on the tutor as well; he acquires a growing interest in his own students as individuals and a feeling of responsibility for their achievements or failures. The knowledge that they will face the most vigorous sort of competition in the final examination provides an additional incentive, if any is needed, for achieving the fullest possible development of each student in the time available. This of course can be accomplished only by appropriately varying homework assignments according to the individual student's ability and motivation—a possibility uniquely afforded by the tutorial system.

To a great extent the tutorials constitute the backbone of the teaching program, and all other work is adapted to their needs. In the lecture program, for example, the criterion of effectiveness is not detailed thoroughness, but rather the extent to which the student is stimulated. The lecturer acquires greater freedom to elaborate on topics of particular interest, and is in fact under some compulsion to do so, for often a failure on the part of the lecturer to present worth-while lectures results in a gradual drop in attendance and a corresponding increase in the burden of instruction left

to the tutors. Since most faculty members devote part of their time to lecturing and part to tutoring, they tend to exert an indirect pressure upon each other for maintenance of high lecture standards. In fields where a comprehensive coverage is imperative, the knowledge that every student is in a position to obtain help from his tutor permits the lecturer to adopt a pace suitable for the quicker students, and by sustaining this pace free of interruptions from either student questions or midterms, to present the standard material for his course in as little as half the time devoted in America.

The importance of outside reading at Oxford and Cambridge, as at all British universities, is reflected in the usage of the expression "reading" philosophy, or "reading" chemistry, in exactly the same sense as the American term "majoring." In the liberal arts this reading is directed almost entirely toward the study of original sources, rather than survey textbooks, and even in the technical fields there is never a "required text." The necessity for supplementing the terse, topical lectures forces the student to develop considerable initiative and critical ability in obtaining information from books, and although this imposes a certain burden on the student, as well as on the tutor, it has the decided advantage that once the student has learned to rely extensively on independent reading, he is in a position to make much progress on his own, not only during his undergraduate vacations but after the completion of his formal university training.

IV

In considering whether the tutorial system might have a potential utility for American universities as a means to accelerate the training of the more able undergraduates, it is first of all essential to recognize a few rather serious obstacles. The conditions under which such a system would have to operate in an American university, as well as the purposes it would be required to serve, are fundamentally different from those of its native environment, and there is consequently no assurance that it would function as successfully as in the British universities. The chief problems appear to center around two questions: could tutorial teaching at an American

university be justified economically, and if so, what alterations would be necessitated in adapting it to the particular needs of American undergraduate training?

The economic question stems from the fact that tutoring is time-consuming for faculty members. Although lecturing demands are cut at least in half by the tutorial system, it is an inescapable fact that an hour of tutoring is very nearly as wearing as an hour of lecturing, and hence faculty members cannot ordinarily undertake more than eight or nine tutorials per week without seriously curtailing their time for lecture preparation or research. The most favorable climate for a system involving individual tutorials for all students is thus one in which the ratio of total number of students to total faculty members does not exceed 8 or 9 to 1. The average ratio for British universities, where enrollments are restricted to a more select group of students, is well within this range. At American universities, on the other hand, student-faculty ratios range from 12 to 1 to as high as 30 to 1, with an average of about 16 or 17 to 1.

The employment of one full-time faculty member for each eight or nine students would seem to be an expenditure well beyond the means of most American universities. This conclusion would be modified to some extent, however, if a system of instruction were utilized that materially shortened the residence period. It is instructive in this connection to calculate how many instructors can be supported on the income tax paid by graduates in their first year out of college. Such an analysis reveals that on the basis of present tax and salary rates, a three-year tutorial university with an 8 to 1 student-faculty ratio is inherently as economical as a four-year nontutorial university with a 16 to 1 ratio. It would perhaps be over-optimistic to expect a tutorial system to reduce the training period for all undergraduates by a full year, but some acceleration in instruction rates could unquestionably be achieved, not only in lecture programs but also in the average student's daily work schedule. Although the tutorial would not obviate the need for course finals, it could well replace the numerous midterms and would eliminate much unproductive effort the student devotes to inappropriate homework assignments.

Despite these economies in instructional procedure, many Amer-

ican universities would find that tutoring all undergraduates imposed excessive teaching loads on faculty members. In such cases relief may be obtained by tutoring some students in pairs rather than individually, a recourse quite commonly employed in Britain whenever student-faculty ratios become excessively high. Another possibility would be to employ qualified graduate students to undertake a limited amount of tutoring. Such expedients might easily make an undergraduate tutorial system feasible for American universities with present student-faculty ratios as high as 15 or 16 to 1—at least so far as economic considerations are concerned.

The second question in connection with transplanting a tutorial system concerns the alterations which might be required to meet the special needs of the American university. While the type of tutorial developed in Britain would seem appropriate for the more able American student, a slightly different approach might be necessary for students who are not preparing to enter a scholarly or professional field. As we have noted, the American university, by virtue of its singularly ambitious training program, encompasses large numbers of such students; to provide for tutorial supervision of this group would be a novel undertaking indeed. Sufficient flexibility in the tutorial system to serve such a purpose may be assumed: the unpredictable factor would lie, rather, in what psychological effect careful personal attention might have on these students—what added incentives would develop, and what new interests would be awakened. Only as such effects might be observed in practice would it be possible to evolve appropriate tutoring procedures. Meanwhile, proved procedures should perhaps be modified only in degree—a slower or more rapid pace of instruction, and simpler or more difficult essay or problem-solving assignments. In any case, it is important to bear in mind that whatever success might be achieved in stimulating the less able students, it could in no way alter the fact that the chief justification for employing a tutorial system in an American university would be to accelerate the training of the more able students without segregation. By-products would of course be welcomed, but in the final analysis they must remain incidental to the primary purpose of breaking down the "convoy" system.

Aside from the question of adapting the tutorial system to Amer-

ican conditions, there is in addition an important practical consideration regarding the training of tutors themselves, particularly in view of the diversified nature of first-year curricula in American universities. Barring unforeseen improvements in precollege schooling programs, American universities must continue to provide first-year instruction in a wide number of elementary courses in language, mathematics, history, etc. If students at this level were to be included in a tutorial system, their tutors would be required to familiarize themselves with the material covered in perhaps three or four of these courses. The only alternative would be for the student to work briefly with several different tutors in his first year; this, however, would tend to deprive the tutorial of much of its effectiveness, for if a student can remain with a particular tutor for a year or more, the tutor will take proportionately more interest in, and individual responsibility for, his progress. Although the preparation for tutoring in a number of different first-year subjects would be a source of some inconvenience to the highly specialized American instructor, such courses are sufficiently elementary that once the initial preparation for tutoring were completed, little further study in ensuing years would be necessary.

V

Whatever complacency may be warranted with regard to the present quantity of American undergraduate instruction, there is little question that many educators are conscious of serious limitations in its quality. At the root of the problem lies the need for increased personal contact between instructors and students, as a corrective for the deficiencies inherent in the utilization of mass production techniques for the dispensing of information. The basic teaching system employed in American universities, of lecture-note taking accompanied by assigned reading or problem-solving in a survey text, with periodic examination to promote reasonable diligence in these tasks, succeeds moderately well in the aim of dispensing facts and the opinions of others about those facts, but includes disturbingly little provision for encouraging the student to develop his own powers of generalization, deduction or analysis. The exclusive reliance on examinations for the maintenance of

conscientiousness invariably focuses the student's main attention on grades and class standing, to the detriment of his interest in his subject: he soon discovers that the system can only operate to reward rote learning and conformity at the expense of curiosity, imaginativeness, and independence of mind.

A recognition of some of these problems has perhaps activated the several experiments which have been made with tutorial teaching in American universities. Unfortunately these experiments have borne little resemblance to the sort of tutorial system developed in the British universities. They have generally been restricted to a few outstanding students, and thereby acquired the onus of a segregation; in most cases they have related only to the student's work in one or two courses, usually in the final year, and in no instance has the tutor been given full responsibility for his student's progress in all subjects. In the absence of a clear allocation of *individual responsibility* for the progress of each student, no very impressive results are likely to be achieved.

These experiments in tutorial teaching, however, would at least seem to reflect a consciousness of the problem and an effort to solve it. That they have not gone far enough to realize the main advantages of a genuine tutorial system is no doubt attributable to the economic and other difficulties we have mentioned. Admittedly these difficulties are formidable indeed. When they are weighed against possible benefits, the determinant may prove to be the measure of our aspirations.

STUDENT LIFE IN BAGHDAD

By WALTER J. MEHL

Harpur College

An American educator visiting the college campus in Baghdad would undoubtedly be surprised to find western dress worn by the faculty and students. Instead of seeing the traditional Arab garb of aba (abah for women, an outer garment) and turban, he will find that not only the faculty and students appear much as their counterparts in our country, but that our style of apparel has been adopted by all of the farashes (servants) who work for the colleges. However, our manner of dress has not been taken over completely in terms of our informality. A few men students have taken to the slacks and sport coat motif, but the vast majority of the men are more conservative, and prefer dark suits. The casual sweater or jacket is just not seen. The same conservatism is present in the attire of women. Skirts and sweaters are definitely second choice to the "regular" dress of wool or cotton, and ankle socks and saddle shoes never appear. However, the habits and traditions of the people are slow to change and, therefore, many of the women wear an abah until they arrive on the campus. Then it is folded and carried over the arm, not to be worn again until the student leaves the campus.

A visitor might be further surprised by the fact that women are attending the colleges in a country where "women's rights" do not exist. While co-education is a rather recent innovation, of the ten colleges in Iraq (all in Baghdad), only the College of Agriculture does not accept women students. However, women interested in domestic science can pursue such studies at the only women's college, Queen Aliya. Not only are women permitted to attend the colleges of Iraq, but they are increasingly taking a more active part in the affairs of the colleges.

These "Western" habits are certainly an indication of the progress that is being made in the Iraqi colleges. But it is also an indi-

cation that there is considerable formality and conservatism, as well as the superimposing of the new upon the old, which is reflected in the very actions of the college students. They are formal in terms of pursuing their studies. They are conservative in conducting their social functions. They are continuously trying to bring modern ideas of student life of the Western world to a society that is old-century and Eastern.

II

What, then, is student life like in Baghdad?

First, it must be realized that the student must spend a large share of his time in classes and in preparing for these classes. The preparation is very unlike that which we like to think our students are used to. Emphasis is placed on giving back to the instructor, not just ideas and general facts, but specific ideas and facts—word for word. Realizing that a college student in Baghdad has at least six subjects each semester for which he must do much memorizing, it is understandable that a big portion of his time must be given to attending classes and to “studying.”

This “formal” type of education is manifest in other ways. The student is required to take a completely prescribed program of studies without any electives and without the privilege of transferring from one program to another. His language courses are given in the traditional grammar method, which means that the students are extremely limited in oral English, and find it very difficult to comprehend and work with the visiting American professors.

The college man is a gentleman. Unfortunately, being a gentleman means that you are more inclined to be a spectator than a participant in college social functions. It also means that you are above doing manual labor (the kinds of work the majority of our college students perform to make any social program a success), but very definitely includes political bull sessions at the coffee houses. Of course, women are not permitted at the coffee houses, and this is not an aid to the stimulation of the social life on the campus.

Most of the Iraqi colleges have dormitories, but no dormitory organization for the students. Secondary school graduates in this

country who want to continue their education in their native land must come to Baghdad and, unless they have a home in the city, they must live in the dormitories. Thus far these dormitories have served as no more than places for the students to be housed and fed. Because there are no student dormitory organizations, virtually no activities are planned for the students. When one stops to consider that the students have no communal living other than the dormitories, and when one further considers the amount of social life that centers around the living quarters of the American college student, it is easy to understand why the college student in Baghdad has a rather dull social life.

Not only do the students lack organization in their dormitories, but they have no social clubs, no class organizations, and certainly nothing resembling our forms of student government. Part of this is due to the immaturity of the colleges, part to the lack of faculty interest and leadership, part to the fear of the authorities for any kind of student organization that the communists might take over and use, and part to the lethargic attitude of the students.

The absence of wholesome student organizations on the campuses certainly can only be detrimental to the entire social life of the colleges.

III

What, then, do the students do beyond attend classes, prepare for these classes, and habituate the coffee houses?

In some of the colleges movie and music programs have been started, in most part by visiting professors. These programs are given on a weekly or monthly basis and have had only fair attendance. Their greatest weaknesses seem to be lack of interest on the part of the faculty and administration, and lack of participation on the part of students in the planning and production of the programs.

Most of the colleges have "varsity" teams in soccer football, basketball, volleyball, and track, but with very limited student participation. Intramural sports have not been developed. Facilities for these programs are very meager and poorly developed, just as they are for individual sports, such as tennis. In addition, trained and enthusiastic staff leadership is present in only one or

two of the colleges. Some colleges have no athletic leadership at all. The needs of the colleges in terms of athletic programs cannot be satisfied just by providing facilities and stimulating leadership, but these would go a long way in aiding this phase of the total college program.

A few academic clubs have been organized in some of the colleges. While they do not have extensive programs, they have occasional meetings, and some of them hold one party during the fall semester and a picnic during the spring semester. These affairs are well attended, and the college authorities encourage them. The parties are not like those conducted on the American college campus. At a party held at an Iraqi college the students sit about in small groups and eat cake and fruit and drink tea and Turkish coffee while they visit. Generally some form of entertainment is presented, such as a short play, the reading of poetry, or some musical numbers. A few speeches are always made! However, there is real progress here, for students participate in the planning, and are now asking that some form of dancing be permitted at their parties.

In the past few years the authorities have been encouraging the students to visit the neighboring countries during the winter vacation. In many cases they have given the poorer students help in meeting the expenses of such visits just as they make it possible for them to attend the colleges. These highly desirable excursions have also been encouraged by the exchange of students during this vacation period with colleges in other countries. In some instances the students have been housed in the dormitories of the college they were visiting. It is possible that this program will be expanded, and again one sees definite interest as well as progress.

IV

Generally speaking, the above facts do not present an encouraging story. But even more discouraging is the apparent communist activity on the campuses. Unfortunately, some of the colleges, particularly the Higher Teachers and Engineering Colleges, have been the incubators of communist development in Iraq. The Communists have seized on the normal unrest and immaturity of the students and have succeeded in confusing a fair number of students

on each of the campuses. The communist organizers have also attempted to ally themselves and their objectives with those of the nationalists, and in this way have also been able to increase their following in the past academic year.

However, it must be recognized that progress is being made toward the development of wholesome student activity programs, and that this progress is being made in a country where the present colleges as well as the present form of national government, with which education is closely tied, is young. As both gain in maturity and experience, with education possibly becoming more independent, the situation on the campuses is bound to show greater improvement.

It is also encouraging and important to note the increasing interest on the part of administrations to do something to improve what they now recognize to be an undesirable situation in terms of student life. They understand that students, while they may continue to show great interest in the political situation in their country, can develop other worth-while interests and activities if they are provided with mature and responsible guidance. But this kind of guidance must come mainly from the faculty, a faculty which now has withdrawn considerably from informal student contact. Faculty members need to re-establish their contacts with students and student groups. At the same time it seems that it is now necessary to bring in sound and enthusiastic leaders who are prepared for student personnel work, in order that they too may stimulate and help the students. The educational authorities should also urge faculty members and college administrators toward greater cooperation with students in the developing of adequate programs of activities.

And finally, it is encouraging to note that the students are becoming increasingly aware of their lack of good student life and that they are becoming interested in doing something about it. If progress is to be made toward a sound program, the students must want this to develop, and they must be willing to do something to bring it about. There is real evidence that the students realize that attending the movies downtown and spending hours in the coffee houses not only detract from the possibilities of a good and satisfying campus life, but also leave a void in their total education.

OF TEACHERS AND TAXES

By MALCOLM L. PYE and JOHN M. KUHLMAN

University of Richmond

At the present time the United States Tax Code, as interpreted by the tax authorities, discriminates against college professors and teachers. This inequity is found in (1) the disallowance of certain professional expenses, and (2) the treatment of Class "A" and "B" deductions.

The Internal Revenue Service recognizes the professional status of teachers by permitting the deduction of certain professional expenses in computing taxable net income. The rule apparently followed in distinguishing between deductible and nondeductible items parallels the accountants' distinction between capital and revenue expenditures of the business enterprise. If the expenditure is made to retain one's position, it is deductible; if it is made to improve one's future earning capacity, it is not allowed for the teacher although it would be deductible through depreciation charges for the business firm.

Under the rule noted above, one can deduct the cost of attending summer school if such attendance is required to retain one's present position. Expenses incurred in obtaining the Ph.D. degree are deductible only if that degree is necessary to retain the present position.¹ The investment in a professional library can be treated as a capital expenditure and written off over the life of the library. The cost of professional journals and periodicals and the cost of attending professional conventions are deductible items. Travel for research and study designed to increase prestige and improve one's professional reputation is not an allowable deduction; however, it would be a deductible expense where the teacher is required to travel as a requisite for holding the job. Any expense incurred for research done for pure scholarship or to increase professional standing is nondeductible.

¹ 17 TC 3.

The disallowance of these necessary professional costs, either by immediate write-off or amortization, represents a gross inequity. In support of a decision in which similar items were disallowed, Justice Cardozo said:

Reputation and learning are akin to capital assets, like the good will of an old partnership. For many, they are the only tools with which to hew a path to success. The money spent in acquiring them is wisely spent. It is not an ordinary expense of the operation of a business.¹

Reasoning by analogy can sometimes be helpful, especially where circumstances are similar, but the analogy should be carried to its logical conclusion. Outlays for scholarly research, like expenditures for capital equipment, serve as the basis for increased income-producing power in the future. It is common knowledge within the profession that advancements and salary increases are in large part dependent upon research and publications. If expenditures related to these activities can be compared to capital assets, as Justice Cardozo has done, they should receive equal tax treatment.

It has been pointed out that the tax authorities do recognize that a teacher has professional expenses, but he is required to treat these professional expenses as though they were personal deductions. The doctor, lawyer, or other professional individual is allowed to treat his professional expenses as Class "A" deductions, that is, he is allowed to deduct them from Gross Income in order to compute Adjusted Gross Income. The inequity of this treatment is related to the option granted to all taxpayers of taking a standard deduction or itemizing personal deductions, and it tends to disappear where one is able to itemize the deductions. This inequity falls most heavily upon those just entering the profession with comparatively low incomes, high professional expenses, but not enough personal deductions for itemization.

For purposes of illustration, let us compare the tax treatment of a doctor and a teacher, having the same professional expenses (\$400), the same number of exemptions (taxpayer, spouse, and child), and filing a joint return.

¹ 290 US 111.

	<i>Doctor</i>	<i>Professor</i>
Gross income	\$6,000	\$6,000
Class "A" deductions—professional deductions ¹	<u>400</u>	<u> </u>
Adjusted gross income	\$5,600	\$6,000
Deduct:		
Standard deduction ²	560	600
Exemptions	<u>1,800</u>	<u>1,800</u>
Net taxable income	\$3,240	\$3,600
Taxes owed under the 1954 schedule	648	720

¹ Although the professor has \$400 in professional expenses, they cannot be taken as deductions from Gross Income, but must be deducted from Adjusted Gross Income.

² Since the standard deduction exceeds the professional expenses and personal deductions, the taxpayer would not itemize his personal deductions.

Equity would seem to make certain changes in the tax law desirable. Professional expenses are necessary to the production of income and should be deductible as Class "A" items rather than as personal deductions. The second desired change is in the method of treating certain expenditures contributing to the professional advancement of the individual. Expenses for such items as scholarly research should be treated as capital assets and written off over a period of years in the same fashion as professional libraries. If it makes sense to give depletion allowances to encourage exploration for natural resources, and accelerated depreciation allowances to encourage expansion of industry, it is likewise logical to allow amortization of sums invested in professional education.

THE TEACHER AND AUTHORITY

Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom of the Bowdoin
College Chapter of the American Association of University
Professors¹

I. *General Principles*

Our society recognizes and makes explicit in its Constitution the right of the individual to freedom from interference by the State in a number of his more important concerns. It therefore takes as its unifying principle the value of the individual as a being, capable of free and rational choice, and, in so doing, commits itself to diversity, self-criticism, and growth. The unity of our society ought not to derive exclusively from the political organization called the State, which seems to us but one important expression of that unity. We rightly cherish the State when it serves as a means to the good life; but when we make of it the sole end of the good life we are involved in one of the dangerous confusions of our time. It should be the concern of all men that the public temper never make it inevitable that the State become the focus of all the diverse values in our heritage.

It is proper that, when the State interferes with the recognized freedoms, it should do so only to maintain those very rights within the society, or to preserve its own existence. To say that the existence of the State is in danger is to say, first of all, that a medium within which free individuals may live in mutual respect is in danger. There are today real dangers to the State, so considered, both internal and external, and those dangers must be the constant concern of the appropriate authorities. But there are forces in the country today which seem to maintain that the State is in danger because some supposed complete, explicit, and detailed set of values is not universally adhered to; or because some supposed complete, explicit, and detailed policy of state, put forward as the only one possible to morality and patriotism, is not pursued by the govern-

¹ Formulated in the Spring of 1954 and approved by the membership of the Chapter.

ment. We cannot acknowledge that these demands for conformity have anything to do with the preservation of the State. On the contrary, it seems to us that such demands constitute the greatest present internal danger to the State.

II. *The Function of the Teacher-Scholar*

The freedom most endangered by this pressure towards conformity is freedom of expression, of which academic freedom is an example. Because of a popular feeling that his profession makes the teacher critical of received values, and because he is in a position to influence the young, this pressure has been particularly heavy on the teacher and scholar. It has taken the form of questioning his activities on and off the campus.

Outside the classroom, the teacher-scholar has the same rights of opinion, expression, and persuasion as other citizens; inside the classroom he has the right, at the college and university level, to exercise free choice in his attempts to understand his subject-matter and to communicate that understanding to his students. It has been generally understood that he may examine all premises freely; that he may argue honestly for his conclusions, making clear the pattern of his thinking; but that he must not indoctrinate, proselytize, or conceal. It is a fair demand that he treat the opinions of his students, however immature, with respect and tact. But any attempt to establish external control by government, or by the private bodies legally responsible for many colleges and universities, is an illegitimate interference. Interference of this sort is especially dangerous in the case of subject-matter that bears more or less directly on received opinions in politics, economics, morals, and religion. In all cases it is an encroachment on the free choice of both student and teacher, and a disruption of the only process so far found for arriving at truth. Nor must utilitarian goals be construed as the sole or even the most important justification for freedom of inquiry. Only when he possesses that freedom can the instructor share with his student the satisfaction of the pursuit of understanding for its own sake.

If the interference with academic freedom comes from government through the exercise of legal powers intended for other purposes, then the diversity and independence of activities that the

State makes possible are marred. If the interference with academic freedom comes through the exercise of the very wide legal powers possessed by the corporate bodies that govern private institutions, there is an analogous encroachment, for, as these bodies have usually recognized in tenure arrangements and in other ways, faculties do not exist in order to inculcate a set of values laid down for them by those who govern a college at a given time.

This is not to say that academic freedom exists in a vacuum. Our society at large has certain general and more or less settled convictions, some of which we believe ourselves to be setting forth here. Colleges and universities also have their distinctive tones which vary widely. There are some with publicly known religious or ethical convictions which, by acceptance of an appointment, a faculty member agrees not to attack. All this affords a natural check upon the freedom of individuals in relation to a society or to a given institution, and on that of institutions in relation to society. If society at large or a given academic group is affronted in its most settled convictions, and in a way that it cannot assimilate to its own development, it is not to be expected that the individual or the group responsible for the affront will be exempted from all unfavorable consequences. The right of freedom of expression is not intended to produce such exemption, or to guarantee that an individual, of whatever bent or capacities, will fare well in society or in a given faculty; nor does it guarantee any institution the respect of society. Relations between individuals, special groups, and society, are delicate ones. Acceptance in any status, social or professional, is a cumulative matter, and even the recognition of the professional competence of a faculty colleague may cover many things besides his command of a subject-matter. One is not free to behave irresponsibly if he would retain the respect of his colleagues.

Freedom of expression and academic freedom, although subject to natural checks, are nevertheless expected to procure immunity from direct and fairly well-defined retaliation, as, for example, summary dismissal from legal or traditional status for the expression of legal but unpopular opinions. Such retaliation is a perversion of the natural checks we have spoken of; it is unjust in itself and produces an undesirable conformity.

It is our general claim that the natural checks upon freedom are not burdensome when exercised in a wholesome atmosphere; and that they form a sufficient safeguard within academic bodies against all but covertly exercised activity of a conspiratorial nature directed against the State. We believe that these natural checks have sufficient vitality to make it unnecessary and undesirable to require, by government policy, or by the policy of the corporate bodies governing private institutions, the absolute exclusion even of those who would deny the right of the individual to freedom of expression or freedom of choice among political forms. The natural vitality of our faculties, acting in conjunction with their administrative heads, is, we maintain, sufficient to enable them to detect and remove illegitimate uses of the teaching function.

III. *Specific Problems*

It seems to us that our general position outlined above should be made clear by its application to certain practical questions.

1. *Test Oaths*

Oaths of allegiance have their proper function in situations where service to the State is at issue. A case can be made out for non-disloyalty test oaths where both service to the State and a security matter are involved. As such oaths frequently refer to membership in organizations which are not actually illegal, their extension to citizens at large is unjustified and dangerous. These oaths are, nevertheless, being required of more and more special groups of citizens, and teachers as a class have been perhaps the most common target. The one practical effect of these oaths is an increase in timidity and conformity that can have only an ill effect both on our profession and on our society. It is a private matter whether a man decides to sign a test oath, but it is our opinion that in doing so he acquiesces in the interference of the political power in an area where it does not belong.

2. *Inquiry into Political Activity*

Certain congressional committees have claimed to find it necessary to inquire into technically legal political affiliations, such as membership in the Communist Party, in order to determine whether a conspiracy is afoot. It seems to us that membership in the Communist Party at the present time is not a political affiliation in the ordinary sense of the word, and that, except in the case of very naïve members, it involves affiliation with a foreign government. But substantial and effective political machinery exists to

protect the country in this area, and it seems to us that congressional committees, whatever their legal rights in this sphere may be, have often been concerned, not with the detection of conspiracy, but with discrediting our colleges and universities by implying that they tolerate Communist indoctrination, or with discrediting the policies or loyalties of political opponents. This is especially true in some of the investigations of persons who were members of the Communist Party when awareness of its real status was not general. We are persuaded that many of the investigators are consciously or unconsciously moved by the desire to make the ends of the academic community identical in all respects with their own ideal of the ends of the political State.

3. *Appointment and Retention of the Communist Teacher*

There would appear to be a logical contradiction between the ideal obligations of a member of the Communist Party and those of the teacher-scholar as we here define them. Although people are not always single-minded, and it is quite possible for a member of the Communist Party to behave as a teacher in a way inconsistent with his Party membership, it seems to us that a member of the Communist Party is a poor teaching risk. But we do not believe that governmental action designed to make it impossible for colleges and universities to appoint Communists is necessary or desirable in a sphere where natural checks ought to operate unhampered.

The case of respected teacher-scholars of long standing who are discovered to be members of the Communist Party is a special one. Because of the inconsistency with which people behave in these matters, and also because some subject-matter is not susceptible to ideological distortion, we think it undesirable to say categorically that such persons should always be dismissed. Such cases should be handled on an individual basis, and there should be effective faculty participation in determining or judging fitness, as there is normally faculty participation in the original appointment.

4. *Attitude toward Congressional Investigations*

College and university administrators have occasionally gone out of their way to welcome investigations by Congress in order to display their freedom from communist taint. Some have also taken under pressure positions in regard to the use of the Fifth Amendment that have had the effect of encouraging those elements in the Congress and in the public who feel that they have the right to call our colleges to account. Because of the equivocal nature of the pressure being exerted, we deplore all gestures to give way to it, even where such gestures may seem to amount only to the

acknowledgment of certain legal rights vested in the Congress. We think it the duty of administrators to manage their own affairs, and to recognize that in doing so they are confronted not merely with legal questions, but also with matters that bear upon the development of the temper, standards, and traditions that the public finds acceptable. An unhealthy public atmosphere can well permit the use of legal powers in spheres for which they were not intended.

5. *The Use of the Fifth Amendment*

The Fifth Amendment gives, among other things, to any person the right to refuse to answer any question put by a congressional committee or a federal court if his answer might tend to incriminate him. Although use of the Fifth Amendment may permit a teacher to escape legal consequences, there are social and professional demands which he may expect to face. These might include the satisfaction of his colleagues that he has not wilfully deceived them about the character of his beliefs. It is essential, however, that the use of the Fifth Amendment not be construed as an evidence of guilt. There are situations in which an innocent man may believe with reason that he will suffer punishment by court action if he does not turn to the Fifth Amendment. It seems to us that colleges and universities should settle the Fifth Amendment cases on an individual basis, and that they should not have their right to do so curtailed by either direct or indirect legislation.

IV. *The Responsibility of the Teacher-Scholar*

It is frequently said today that the teacher must exercise his freedom with responsibility. There is an obvious sense in which his functions as we have outlined them imply a sense of responsibility. But to insist that as an individual he must speak with a restraint beyond that imposed by his function, that he must exercise, for instance, a greater circumspection than other citizens in talking politics outside the classroom, is to make an indefensible demand.

There is another sense in which the teacher-scholar should be responsible: he should have the practical responsibilities to which his function gives him the moral right. He is not, for instance, an employee in the ordinary sense of the word, but a member of a scholarly community about whose make-up its own members are the most competent judges. This has usually been recognized at reputable institutions by the rôle given to faculties in the appoint-

ment of new members. But it needs to be recognized that in the case of dismissals for cause, the colleagues of a teacher-scholar are even more competent judges than they were in the case of the original appointment, for they have had in the interim the opportunity to assess not only his intellectual competence, but also his motives, his sincerity, and the temper of his mind by the intimate give-and-take of academic life over a period of time. No circumstantial evidence that does not take these matters into consideration can be valid. It seems, therefore, that the real power of faculties should be even greater in such matters than in the case of original appointments.

In their legal relationship to boards of trustees and regents, our faculties stand in a dependent situation. We believe that it is the moral obligation of such boards of control, not only to refrain from holding the teacher-scholar responsible in illegitimate ways, but also to take steps to insure that his practical responsibilities and practical security more closely approach that which is appropriate to his ideal function.

RIDICULE AND OTHER DETRIMENTS TO EFFECTIVE TEACHING¹

By VIRGINIA VOEKS

San Diego State College

"Those assignments! Does he think this is the only course we have?" "He's terribly unfair—makes up tests filled with trick questions and then grades real low."

Such complaints are common. Some professors even believe these to be the students' major complaints. They seem to believe, further, that low rankings from students on teacher-rating questionnaires are due primarily to these factors: the students' feeling that too much work is assigned or his feeling that the grades are too low.

But are these major complaints? Do they contribute significantly to the differences between teachers who receive high ratings and those who receive low evaluations?

Behind these questions lie more basic ones: What factors cause a person to be a relatively ineffective teacher in the eyes of college students? What characteristics cause another person to be an outstandingly effective teacher?

The study here reported is an effort to answer these questions at least partially.

Procedure

A teacher-rating questionnaire had been given to 284 classes taught by a representative sample of the University of Washington

¹ This is one of a series of studies made possible by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation to the University of Washington. The studies are under the direction of Dr. E. R. Guthrie and the Office of Student Ratings. While in Seattle last summer, the author designed and carried out the study reported here, using completed questionnaires made available by the Office of Student Ratings.

faculty. On the basis of this sample, norms were established for the questionnaire.¹

The questionnaire consisted of the following items:

1. Is clear and understandable in his explanations.
2. Takes an active, personal interest in the progress of his class.
3. Is friendly and sympathetic in manner.
4. Shows interest and enthusiasm in his subject.
5. Gets students interested in his subject.

For each item, the student rated his teacher on a six-point scale. At the end of the questionnaire were spaces for comments, one set of lines for things "he has done especially well in his teaching of this course" and another for "specific things you believe might be done to improve his teaching in this course." Over 90% of the students wrote comments.

For the present study, we selected from the total sample those teachers whose mean rating on the questionnaire placed them either in the top 10% or bottom 10% of the faculty. Analyses then were made of all criticisms by the 1,503 students who rated these teachers.

Table I shows the frequency with which various criticisms were made, both of teachers rated in the bottom 10% of the faculty and for those rated in the top 10% of the faculty. The table also includes a statistical analysis of the significance of these differences.

In Table II further data are presented. Tabulating merely the incidence of various criticisms might be misleading, for although some characteristic was mentioned by many students, the students

¹ The sample was selected in the following manner: From alphabetical lists of instructors, of assistant professors, and of associate professors at the University, every *n*th person was selected. The *n* differed from rank to rank to insure drawing approximately 100 names for each academic rank. If the teacher had at least one class of more than ten students, he was notified that he was part of a random sample to standardize a new teacher-rating questionnaire and his cooperation was solicited. The faculty were very cooperative, over 95% agreeing to help. This gave a sample of 284 faculty, unusually representative of the entire faculty in the three lower ranks at that university.

For each of these teachers, a teacher-rating questionnaire was filled out by students of one class, the class being chosen by the teacher. Probably the teacher chose the class with which he thought he was doing the most effective job. Therefore, the ratings may average slightly higher than they would if *all* students of that teacher were polled. However, since this is true for each teacher, the ratings for different teachers should be comparable.

From these ratings, decile norms were prepared for each item on the questionnaire and for the "total." Grace French designed and conducted this investigation.

might all be in, say, two or three classes. That is, the liability might be mentioned frequently, but for only a few teachers. Therefore, Table II gives the percentage of teachers in the bottom 10% and the percentage of teachers in the top 10% about whom each type of criticism was made by two or more members of the same class.

The "two or more" criterion was used because one student might be a dissident soul with a view peculiar to himself; but when at least two students working independently make the same criticism of some teacher, the criticism probably has something to do with the nature of the teacher being discussed. Were a check-list presented to that class, probably a considerable number of the class-members would check an item as characterizing their professor when that point had been spontaneously mentioned by two or more of their classmates.

Discussion of Results

As expected, "unfair grades" and "too much work" were common complaints. However, three facts make it unwise for us to construe either of these as a major cause of low ratings: 1) Although unfair grades and too much work were mentioned for more bottom decile faculty than top decile faculty, these differences are not very reliable statistically (see Table II). In fact, the differences between low-rated and high-rated teachers on these two factors are among the least reliable differences found in the entire study. 2) Other criticisms were made with almost as great or far greater frequency for people in the bottom 10% (see Table I); and 3) some of these other liabilities were rarely or never attributed to faculty in the top 10% (see Tables I and II). It is among such characteristics, common among the bottom faculty and rare among the top, that we most profitably can search for causes of low ratings.

Let us look now at these characteristics which distinguish sharply the relatively poor teachers from the excellent teachers. One of these is being too obvious in lectures. "He repeats himself too much." "He repeats the text far too much." "He says almost nothing in class which isn't in the textbooks." "He spends too much time on simple points we already know and understand."

Such criticisms frequently were made about teachers in the bottom 10%; they were made approximately as often as "giving unfair grades" or "assigning too much work." Furthermore, this criticism was not limited to a few teachers. Roughly, one-third of the teachers in the bottom 10% had two or more students who spontaneously commented upon the teacher's being too obvious.

Dwelling upon the obvious, repeating himself or the text too much, so common among the bottom 10%, almost never occurred among the faculty rated highly by their students. One student

TABLE 1—FREQUENCY OF VARIOUS TYPES OF STUDENT CRITICISMS

Type of Criticism	Number of Students Mak- ing Criticism About Teachers in		Diff. ¹	SE _{diff.} ²	CR ³
	Bottom Decile	Top Decile			
Belittles students (236 comments)	172	6	20.99%	1.67	12.57**
Uses sarcasm and overt ridicule ⁴	88	3			**
Becomes angry easily; rude; irritable	33	..			**
Ignores our opinions and questions	30	2			**
Has superiority complex; looks down on us	25	..			**
Treats us like children; talks down	19	..			**
Belittles us in various ways ⁵	41	1			**
Dwells upon the obvious (49 comments)	47	1	5.82	0.91	6.40**
Spends too much time on simple points	14	..			**
Repeats himself too much	26	1			**
Repeats the textbook too much	9	..			**
Requires too much outside study; as- sumes too much background; has too fast a pace	54	14	4.89	1.23	3.97**
Uses unfair grading system (58 com- ments)	56	20	4.31	1.13	3.81**
Unfair examinations	36	10			**
Too few examinations	4	2			
Unfair or too low grades	18	8			
Has voice inadequacies—speaks too softly, mumbles, etc.	32	1	3.92	0.76	5.18**
Lectures unprepared	30	..	3.81	0.72	5.28**

TABLE 1 (continued)

Type of Criticism	Number of Students Mak- ing Criticism About Teachers in		Diff. ¹	SE _{diff.} ²	CR ³
	Bottom Decile	Top Decile			
Makes unclear assignments; does not let us know what is important	31	4	3.37	0.78	4.33**
Lacks self-confidence	12	..	1.52	0.46	3.31**
Is inexperienced	11	..	1.40	0.44	3.18**
Does poor blackboard work	10	..	1.27	0.42	3.02**
Does not help us understand our mis- takes	9	..	1.14	0.40	2.87**
Uses a poor textbook	6	..	0.76	0.33	2.30*
Speaks too rapidly or too slowly	41	38	-0.11	1.16	0.09
Has other liabilities	88	28	7.25	1.38	5.25**
Total number of class members	788	715			

¹ For each category, the difference in percentages between comments by the top teachers' students and by the bottom teachers' students was computed as follows: The number of *students* who made one or more criticisms falling in that category (not the total number of such comments) is divided by the total number of students. For example, with respect to "belittling," the difference is $[(172/788) - (6/715)]$
 $100 = 21.83\% - 0.84\% = 20.99\%$.

² The $SE_{diff.} = \sqrt{(PrQr/N_1) + (PrQr/N_2)}$, with $N_1 = 788$ and $N_2 = 715$.

³ The statistical significance of the difference in percentages is indicated by the asterisks: ** indicates significance beyond the 1% confidence level ($P < 0.01$), i.e., the difference would occur less than one time in 100 by "chance," were there no systematic difference in the groups; * indicates significance beyond the 5% confidence level ($P < 0.05 > 0.01$), i.e., the difference would occur between one and five times out of 100 by "chance."

⁴ Illustrating overt ridicule are such comments as the following, written by four students about four different teachers:

"His attitude in class conveys to his students that he believes each one to have the intelligence of an imbecile; yet he is very unsympathetic when a student fails to know the answer to his every question."

"Uses sarcasm and ridicule in criticism of student behavior."

"She has the bad habit of discouraging poorer students until they feel they know nothing and should leave school—when often they are pretty good, as she sometimes finds out later."

"He calls students stupid when they ask questions he cannot give proper answers to. Very bullheaded and antagonistic towards opinions contrary to his own."

⁵ Classified here are such comments as the following:

"Rarely if ever has he been on time for a lecture, which is an example of his indifference toward the students."

"Has a habit of assigning several problems, and then withdrawing that assignment and making a new one after we had done part of it. No consideration. He is generally disliked."

"She contradicts herself and will never admit being wrong. Even when we prove her wrong very often."

said, "Sometimes the prof repeats material unnecessarily." No other student of that professor nor of any other professor in the top 10% made such a comment. This difference between the top and bottom 10% of the faculty is a marked one, and significant considerably beyond the 1% confidence level. (That is, such a difference would occur less than one time in a hundred by "chance," if

TABLE II—PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ABOUT WHOM VARIOUS CRITICISMS WERE MADE BY TWO OR MORE OF THEIR STUDENTS

Type of Criticism ¹	Percentage of teachers				
	Bottom Decile	Top Decile	Diff.	SE _{diff.} ²	CR ³
Uses "belittling" techniques	60.71%	6.90%	53.81%	12.49	4.31**
Dwells upon the obvious in lectures	32.14	...	32.14	9.66	3.33**
Makes unclear assignments	28.57	3.45	25.12	9.66	2.60*
Has voice inadequacies	25.00	...	25.00	8.70	2.85**
Uses unfair grading system	28.57	10.34	18.23	10.45	1.74
Lectures unprepared	14.29	...	14.29	6.77	2.11*
Does poor blackboard work	14.29	...	14.29	6.77	2.11*
Uses a poor textbook	14.29	...	14.29	6.77	2.11*
Requires too much outside study; assumes too much background; has too fast a pace	25.00	13.79	11.21	10.45	1.07
Speaks too rapidly, or too slowly	25.00	13.79	11.21	10.45	1.07
Is inexperienced	10.71	...	10.71	5.92	1.81
Does not help us understand our mistakes	10.71	...	10.71	5.92	1.81
Lacks self-confidence	7.41	...	7.41	4.87	1.47

¹ Arranged according to the size of the difference between percentages of bottom and top teachers having the characteristic.

² The formula for the standard error of the difference is the same as for Table 1, except $N_1 = 28$ and $N_2 = 29$.

³ As in Table 1, * indicates significance beyond the 5% confidence level, ** indicates significance beyond the 1% level.

there were no systematic difference between the top and bottom teachers.) The extent to which they dwell upon the obvious may well reflect a basic difference between teachers deemed outstandingly effective and those held in relatively low esteem by the students.

We turn now to the most striking difference between teachers in the top 10% and bottom 10%: their use of overt ridicule, sarcasm directed against the student, and more subtle forms of belittling. Such techniques are almost non-existent among teachers in the top 10% apparently. Of their 715 students, only six mentioned

any sort of belittling in commenting upon any top decile teacher. For only one teacher in the top 10% was sarcasm or overt ridicule mentioned by two students, and these students qualified their remarks with an "occasionally." One other teacher in the top decile "occasionally" did something else construed by two of his students as somewhat belittling.

In sharp contrast with the rarity with which *any* top teacher uses such techniques, many teachers in the bottom 10% employ them often. For this group, belittling ranks first in terms of *number of teachers* about whom a criticism was made by two or more members of a class. In fact, for the bottom 10% of the teachers, belittling the student characterizes roughly twice as many teachers as does any other liability. Over 60% of the teachers in the bottom 10% use belittling extensively enough that at least two members of a single class commented upon it. Less than one time in 10,000 would we find such a large difference between top and bottom teachers were there no systematic difference between the two groups ($P < 0.0001$).

Furthermore, belittling takes first place also in terms of *number of adverse comments* written. By a wide margin, the most frequently mentioned liability for low-rated teachers is sarcasm against the student and overt ridicule of his intelligence or other desired assets. Though only six comments were written about this and other forms of belittling for the top-rated faculty, there were 236 comments about belittling for the bottom faculty.

Suppose we combine the five types of criticisms made next most frequently about faculty of the bottom 10%: Gives unfair exams, too few exams, unfair grades, or too low grades; requires too much outside work, has too fast a pace in the course, or assumes too extensive background; spends too much time on simple points in lectures, repeats himself too much, or repeats the text too much; speaks too rapidly, or speaks too slowly; mumbles, speaks too softly, or has some other speaking liability. For the bottom 10% of the faculty, criticisms on all these points combined is surpassed by criticisms about belittling.

Further, the bottom faculty received twice as many adverse remarks *on this single subject alone*, belittling by the teacher, as the faculty in the top 10% received about *all* liabilities combined.

When a teacher tries to motivate the student by making fun of

him (either subtly, by ignoring his opinions, or grossly, by ridiculing him for mistakes), by making sarcastic remarks about his or the class's intelligence, or by using other similar devices, we would expect that teacher to receive low ratings on item 2 of the questionnaire: "Is friendly and sympathetic in manner." We might expect such a teacher also to receive low ratings on item 3: "Takes an active personal interest in the progress of his class." Such was the result. Teachers who used "belittling" devices to the extent that two members of a class commented upon it averaged in the bottom 10% on each of these items.

Teachers who use such techniques perhaps do not realize, however, that covert and overt ridicule may also seriously impair the student's *understanding* of the lecture material and kill his interest in pursuing the work farther. On item 1, "Is clear and understandable in his explanations" and on item 5, "Gets students interested in his subject," teachers using belittling techniques again average in the bottom 10%. It is unlikely that this reflects an adverse "halo," because most students' ratings showed considerable scatter from one item to another, although they tended to be somewhere near the low end of the scale. It may be, of course, that the cause-and-effect works the other way: Perhaps a teacher's relative inability to present explanations in ways the student perceives as understandable or a teacher's relative inability to interest the student by other methods is a part of what causes the teacher to resort to ridicule of the student—a rather desperate step, it would appear from this study.

The students also expressed concern about voice inadequacies of teachers in the bottom 10%. A quarter of those faculty tend to speak too softly, or mumble, or have some other speech liability, judging from their students' comments. (Are these voice inadequacies, possibly, a very subtly expressed indifference toward the student and his welfare?)

A few other shortcomings also are possessed by a disproportionately large number of teachers assigned low ratings (see Table 11). However, none of these defects appear to be as serious or as common as overstressing the obvious and belittling the students in grosser ways.

For the top 10% of the teachers, the main shortcoming appears to be speaking too rapidly. (No student said any teacher in the

top 10% spoke too slowly.) "Speaking too rapidly" was mentioned roughly twice as often as any other liability for the top teachers, and apparently is possessed by a higher percentage of them than any other liability except "assumes too much background." Each of these characteristics was mentioned for 14% of the top teachers.

Summary

An analysis was made of criticisms by 1503 students of teachers whose mean rating on a student questionnaire placed them in the top or bottom 10% of the University of Washington faculty.

As shown in Table 1, many criticisms were made *significantly more often* about bottom decile teachers than about top decile teachers. The most outstanding difference was with respect to belittling techniques. This single matter was mentioned more often for the bottom decile teachers than all liabilities combined for the top teachers.

As shown in Table 11, the following criticisms were made by at least two students per class for *significantly more teachers* rated in the bottom 10% than for teachers of the top decile: 1) belittles students, 2) dwells upon the obvious, 3) has voice inadequacies. Each of the foregoing differences between the bottom and top decile faculty is significant beyond the 1% level of confidence (*i.e.*, would occur less than one time in 100 by "chance").

Significant beyond the 5% level, but not significant at the 1% level, are the following: 1) being unprepared for lectures, 2) doing poor blackboard work, 3) using a poor text, 4) making unclear assignments and not letting his students know what is important.

Contrary to a prevalent notion, neither unfair tests and grades nor requiring too much work is criticized most frequently. (Explicit or implicit ridicule ranks first.) Further, neither unfair tests and grades nor requiring too much work is mentioned for significantly more teachers given low ratings than for teachers given extremely high ratings by their students. These data do not support the belief that students assign low ratings to a teacher because he is a "hard" grader.

The present data suggest further that top decile teachers may not merely possess a higher degree of certain desirable characteristics than do low-rated teachers. Rather, there seems to be a

difference in *kind* between teachers ranked extremely high and those ranked extremely low by students.

This difference in kind appears to be linked with the teachers' conception of the students: Teachers ranked low by students tend to seriously underestimate their listeners in various ways, and to have a somewhat condescending and belittling attitude toward them. Low-rated teachers seem to feel that students must be goaded into work by threats and other fear-arousing techniques, lest they not work at all. At any rate, the low-rated teachers frequently employ ridicule and sarcasm, appear to regard students as underlings, and treat them "like children."

The teachers rated highly by the students do not share this viewpoint. Virtually never do these teachers use ridicule, even covertly. No teacher in the top 10% repeats the text or his lecture material more often than the students feel is necessary. Neither do they dwell upon the "obvious." They never were accused of talking down to the class, nor of treating the students like children, nor of being rude or irritable. They never were said to have a "superiority complex" or to look down upon the students. The top ranking teachers treat the students, and their questions and opinions, with respect (although they may explicitly disagree with the opinion). Their main error, and even this occurs rarely, is slightly to overestimate the student—they have a slight tendency to speak too rapidly or to assume somewhat more background than is possessed.

Low-rated teachers seem to be seriously out of touch with their students and to view them somewhat cynically. The top teachers appear to regard the student as a colleague in a mutually cherished enterprise. They communicate a great respect for and faith in the student. The two groups of teachers differ in what they believe students to be like, with a consequent difference in their techniques of teaching and motivation.

Further research is planned to check upon these ideas, for they could be a key to many problems: Quite possibly, regarding students as valued colleagues and communicating a deep faith in them is a crucial part of what constitutes the great teacher. This may be the basic difference between great teachers and the mediocre or ineffective.

THE "TECHNICAL" ART OF MANUSCRIPT REPORTING

By ROBERT K. MURRAY

Pennsylvania State University

For the past several years the *Bulletin* has contained a number of interesting and provocative articles on a subject most dear to the serious scholar's heart—the problem of publishing.

Since most of these articles were written by scholars, they centered quite logically on the various malpractices of the publishing industry which serve to prevent or discourage both research and publication. In particular, publishers were chastized for their insistence on exorbitant author subsidies, their over-emphasis on manuscript "marketability," and their general disregard for works of a purely scholarly or professional character.¹ If one has gone through the toil, sweat, and years required to bring forth a scholarly manuscript only to have it rejected because it won't "sell" or because one cannot possibly scrape together two or three thousand dollars, he has long since raised a solemn "Amen" to these charges.

On the other hand, it must be candidly admitted that most of us are extremely egotistical and over-sensitive about our written work; as a result, on any given publishing question the fires of our resentment are apt to burn uncommonly bright. Hence, we are sometimes inclined, regardless of the real reasons involved, to heap upon the publishers the sole responsibility for thwarting our personal publishing goals. Indeed, our bitterness extends not only to condemning publishers for the manner in which they handle our own writings but also to excoriating them for the piddling honoraria which they offer us for our professional advice on those of others.²

¹ For an example see Silas Vance, "What Price Publication?—University Presses," Winter, 1951-52 *Bulletin*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 711-716.

² See Stephen B. Jones, "What Price Criticism?" Winter, 1950 *Bulletin*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 744-747; Robert Bierstedt, "What Price Criticism?—Continued," Summer, 1951 *Bulletin*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 276-280.

It would truly seem that on the basis of our common experience we are beset on all sides by unsympathetic and money-hungry "demons" who would extract or withhold from us our due.

Counter-claims from the defenders of the publishing companies (which have also appeared in the *Bulletin*) seemingly have affected us not at all and we persist in holding our original beliefs. We are neither swayed by their appeal to our natural desire "to help the profession" by giving of our time freely (or virtually free), nor are we impressed by their cries that the publishing industry can ill afford to pay us more for our professional services. Nor, being essentially proud, do we willingly accept the bald fact that much of what we ourselves do write isn't of publishing caliber anyway—and assuage our ego by steadfastly maintaining that they are wrong and we are right.¹

Engaging as this debate may be, and aside from the various charges involved, there seems to be at least one point on which there is virtual unanimity.² And it is precisely here that I feel we delude ourselves and undermine our position completely.

The professor, or scholar, is constantly referred to as the crutch upon which the publishing industry leans. He is the "adviser" to the industry, and the broad inference is that much (although not all) of what the publisher ultimately publishes will depend directly upon his word. One can hardly escape the conclusion, therefore, that in the majority of cases it will be he, and not the publisher, who will determine which poor struggling writer will be singled out to pay the author subsidy, or, worse still, be denied the chance of seeing his manuscript in print at all. One is compelled to ask: Who after all is the *bête noire* of the publishing business—the publisher or the professor himself?

One further observation. It is automatically assumed by the profession that the professor is not merely an "adviser," but an "expert adviser." He it is who supposedly gives the "carefully considered opinion" upon which the life of a manuscript may depend. It is he who supplies the "highly technical and expert advice" needed and gives the manuscript the "careful examination"

¹ See Bierstedt, *ibid.*

² The lone dissenting opinion appears in Robert J. Clements, "What Price Criticism?—Antitheses and Syntheses," Autumn, 1951 *Bulletin*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 556-563.

required. It is taken for granted that the publisher must have this "expert opinion" before he can decide to publish; indeed, it is implied that without such technical assistance his publishing firm would totter and fall. Scholars have been quick to buttress this belief by reiterating (if only to convince themselves) that their advice is *really* expert and technical and more important to the publisher than riches or gold.

II

There are probably few writers who at some time or other have not been confronted by a "reader's report." The process goes something like this: The author submits his manuscript to a publishing house. He receives in exchange a terse card stating that the manuscript has arrived and has been placed in the hands of the editorial staff. The card usually closes by thanking the author for submitting the manuscript and asking his forbearance in any delay in a decision.

If the manuscript has any merit at all, after editorial staff review it is sent to one or more outside readers for their professional opinion. As a result, the author's forbearance may have to last for anywhere from a month to a year and a half. At the end of this period of suspenseful waiting (if, indeed, the author remembers he has a manuscript still in circulation), he will either receive a letter from the editor containing a publication offer or a short note from an assistant editor informing him that the firm cannot handle his work. Among the rejection reasons most often given are: (1) previous publishing commitments which are positively staggering ("You might try again in two years, etc."); (2) insufficient operating funds, which at the moment are at their lowest ebb in the company's history; (3) the manuscript should really be handled by a commercial press, or a university press (whichever that particular firm is not); or (4) the readers' reports.

In the first three instances the press will probably be operating entirely on its own initiative and the author finds himself actually defeated by those commercial interests from whom he has long since expected little mercy. But in the fourth case he discovers himself pitted against his own colleagues, his supposed friends,

and the encounter may prove somewhat disconcerting. Here, at last, he comes face to face with the "expert adviser," the same man for whom he had felt sorry because the publishing industry was paying him starvation wages.

Even a cursory examination of his sheaf of readers' reports soon convinces the author that his sympathy may have been somewhat misplaced. The reports often vary so widely in their separate opinions that they prove utterly worthless in enabling the author either to better his manuscript or plan an intelligent course of action. Actually, some of the reports can be dismissed immediately because they were written (1) by an imposter who obviously knows little about the subject, (2) by a charlatan who is more interested in impressing the publisher with what he knows that the author doesn't know than with what the author knows, or (3) by an interloper who also has a manuscript in preparation on the subject and is fearful lest a favorable report on the author's work might make his own subsequent effort a drug on the market.

Most readers' reports, however, are obviously conscientious attempts to assess the value of the author's writing. Yet, it is these, even more than the others, which cast serious doubts on the "technical and expert advice" rendered. I am talking now of the manuscript which has some merit—not the brilliant manuscript (which would be published anyway), nor the poor manuscript (which would never get beyond the company's editorial staff).

On a recent manuscript of mine, I received no less than ten different readers' opinions extending over a period of one year. Four of these could be immediately discarded as belonging to the three unsavory categories listed above. The remaining six I am sure represented bona-fide pieces of work. One would reasonably expect from these six "experts" a fairly uniform and concrete evaluation of the manuscript; and while I might not always agree with their opinions I did expect at least a measure of enlightenment. Unfortunately, such was not the case.

On the matter of organization my six "experts" were hopelessly divided. The first expert maintained that the manuscript's organization was "smoothly consummated without a break in basic continuity." He thought my topical approach to the subject was infinitely better than any attempt at continuous chronology and

complimented me for not falling into this pitfall. The second expert claimed my organization was completely unsound; he implied that anyone with half a brain would know better than to treat my subject on a topical basis. Chronologically, he said, was the only proper way to handle it. The third expert thought I should have used a combination approach. This, he felt, would have resulted in better rapport between myself and the reader. This expert was willing to admit that in certain instances my topical method was indeed best, but in others the chronological would have been even better. Unfortunately, he did not say where. The remaining three experts had somewhat different opinions, but on the whole seemed about as confused concerning the organization as I was after reading the advice of the first three.

Interpretation proved an even stickier matter for the experts. All of them had something rather definite to say about at least one interpretation and they belabored the point excessively. One would have thought I had committed some gross, unspeakable crime. To one critic John L. Lewis was a knight in shining armor and the fact that I did not so interpret him proved utterly disastrous. To another, Woodrow Wilson was the Messiah, himself, and since I did not agree I was immediately consigned to limbo. One expert thought my work was too pro-labor; another condemned it as too pro-business. One critic roundly scored me for putting too many of my own opinions in the manuscript, while another wrote, "It is hard to tell where the author stands within 90 degrees." Still another reader claimed I saw everything "as black and white"; his counterpart complained that I wrote with the attitude that "everybody is a little wrong and yet a little right." He, no doubt, never read a reader's report.

Fact authentication and accuracy in reporting would seem to be an easy matter for experts to agree on; yet even here there was no clear-cut meeting of minds. All the critics took exception to at least one source I had used; never, however, was it the same source. Nevertheless, I must frankly admit that they shared an uncanny, almost supernatural, facility for ferreting out minor and relatively insignificant mistakes such as dates ("it should be January 9 instead of January 10") or the middle names of public men ("Justice Edward T. Sanford, not Edward V. Sanford"). Whether this was

done for my benefit or for the larger purpose of convincing the publisher that they were really earning their meager honorarium and living up to their reputation of giving "technical and expert advice," I do not know.

On the matter of style and grammar, the experts were again at odds. While they agreed that the writing was "generally acceptable," they disagreed violently on how it might be improved. One said the narrative was not quite lively enough; another thought it was perhaps too lively and in spots even sensational. In one report I found these two interesting statements by the same critic: "The grammar is sound and the work well written," and "Considerable editing of the grammar and style will have to be undertaken if the manuscript is published."

Thus, over a period of a year it was my misfortune to have the expert professional opinion of at least six of my colleagues who were seriously bent on assessing accurately the publication worth of my work. It would be difficult to say how many man hours were spent on probing my manuscript until it was all but illegible from the handling. Yet, except for the occasional error in spelling, name, or date that was brought to my attention, it availed me practically nothing. I was disheartened and disillusioned—worse, I was completely confused.

III

My conclusion is obvious. While I can generally agree with the several gentlemen who so ably stated the case against publishers in past issues of the *Bulletin*, I cannot on the basis of my experience shed many tears for some of the "underpaid" professorial experts who undertake manuscript reporting. One must admit that in the case of the conscientious reviewer it does require a certain amount of his time. This should be worth something. Also when done properly, a degree of skill is employed and in the process some "technical and expert advice" may actually emerge.

However, in the case of many readers' reports the author is left to wonder just how much time and skill were spent. Certainly, he is skeptical of the conflicting opinions given. The author, perhaps, has spent four, six, or even eight years of his valuable non-

teaching time on a research topic only to subject it to the rather cursory examination of so-called professional experts who not only cannot agree but whose weighty and conflicting opinions are the product of only five, ten, or even twenty hours' work.

Often, to the author at least, the wonder is not what these experts were paid, but that they were paid at all. Who knows?—maybe publishers sometimes wonder the same thing.

THIS PRESSURE TO PUBLISH

By JOHN E. OWEN

Florida Southern College

During the past few years much has been written about the tendency of American college and university administrators to require productive research and publication as a basis for academic promotions and advancement. The situation has been decried in faculty clubs, conferences, and academic journals.

In an issue of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors some time ago, a young man was advised not to be a teacher mainly on the grounds that success in the academic profession is based not upon teaching ability *per se* but rather upon the ability to pursue the type of research that eventuates in scholarly articles and books. More recently, in the Winter, 1952-53 *Bulletin*, Professor Grant H. Redford's article, entitled "Publish or Else," maintained, in effect, that publication today is largely governed by "the questionable virtues of chance, accident, caprice, and the least worthy elements of aggressive salesmanship," and that the current emphasis on publication in higher education is doing infinitely more harm than good.

It is the thesis of this short paper that the unwholesome features of the much-maligned pressure to publish have been exaggerated and that other facets of the actual situation need to be pointed out in order to bring the problem as it exists into better focus.

II

In the first place, on many campuses, and by no means exclusively at small schools or teachers colleges, pressure to publish is so slight as to be almost nonexistent. Literally hundreds of college and university teachers in America today are holding excellent posts and are respected on their campuses and in the surrounding

communities despite the fact that they have not published an article in years, and may indeed show little sign of later publication. As Roy P. Basler reminded us ("Further Advice to Tom," Autumn, 1951 *Bulletin*), the academic profession is one of the few in which advancement comes slowly but surely with seniority, and in terms of financial status the difference between a professor of twenty or twenty-five years' standing who has not published and one who has published is unlikely to be more than one thousand dollars a year. The difference in their reputations outside the bounds of a particular campus may be vast, but in terms of professional salary received, any difference will not normally be large.

The royalties accruing from the sale of a popular textbook are often cited, and yet even here the man whose output consists solely or largely of textbooks is hardly likely to become recognized as a scholarly leader in his field. Dollarwise, he may even be penalized. For are there not some universities that insert a clause in a professor's contract to the effect that if extra income from writing or outside lecturing exceeds a set figure, the salary received from the institution must perforce be adjusted downwards?

In all fairness, it must be granted that, *other things being equal*, publication would in many institutions appear to be the factor that determines raises in rank and salary. But these "other things" are seldom equal and it is unrealistic to ignore this fact, as is done by many of those who declaim against the pressure to publish. There are cases, perhaps more uncomfortably frequent than is usually admitted, in which the publication of an article or book by a faculty member may have adverse consequences if his department chairman or dean has failed to publish. Apart from these negative situations, a friendly personality with undergraduates and that complex of attitudes and behavior-patterns that colleagues and superiors describe as "cooperative" (very important word!) can often bring advancement far faster than the most imposing array of offprints.

Teachers of experience know that the particular demands of an academic post will vary from campus to campus and that the esteem in which publication is held is by no means a constant factor in the deliberations of different administrations and committees on promotion policy. A willingness to take part in community

projects or in church affairs may in some localities far outweigh any importance attached to research. Prominence in professional societies and election to office in these societies are not necessarily correlated with publication. In many colleges there is a recognition that the teaching function and the research function are two separate entities and a man is not penalized because he cannot skilfully combine the two. How many institutions, to quote Professor Redford, "are placing an increasing emphasis on publication as *the* measure of a faculty member's worth"? There are institutions where publications evoke so little administrative approval that faculty morale is lowest among the few teachers who do actually publish! In still others, publication does count for something but not for nearly as much as an acquiescence in useful but time-absorbing committee work and glorified clerical duties, not to speak of the subtle personal factors that play their part, in greater or lesser degree, in every institutionalized power-relationship.

Where the size of student enrollment is an important factor in legislative appropriations (and in how many state universities is this not so?), compliance with the indirect demands arising from this situation is often of far greater import than anything a faculty member may get into print. The man whose grading policy is not in line with administrative pressures will find that half a dozen offprints will do little to win approval. Elsewhere, a willingness to take state-wide sales trips to high schools in an effort at boosting the college enrollment will evoke more tangible thanks from the institutional powers than any number of articles, no matter how impressive the journals in which they appear nor how neat their little rows of footnotes.

One could continue in this vein *ad infinitum*. The point is that the factors governing professional advancement depend largely on the particular institutional connection, and it is unrealistic to suppose that publication *per se* is a widespread and primary *sine qua non* for academic tenure and promotion. If it were so, as many of its disclaimers maintain, why is it that so many faculty members make little effort to publish? A sizable percentage of the teaching staffs at many American colleges and universities do *not* publish. At one fairly typical midwestern state university, a faculty

survey in 1950 revealed that only one teacher in five had published *anything* during the previous three years. It would be interesting to inquire whether the nonpublishing four-fifths regarded themselves as having been stigmatized or penalized for their lack of productive research.

III

The difficulty of getting into print, once the actual research and writing are completed, is likewise frequently bemoaned. *The Modern Language Quarterly*, as Professor Redford noted, publishes between 40 and 50 articles a year, but receives over 150, and has on hand enough material to publish for three years. At the present time a contribution has one chance in fifteen of being accepted. *Publications of the Modern Language Association* receive about 400 articles a year, but have room for only 80. *The American Sociological Review* rejects two articles for every one it prints. And so forth.

These statistics, and the mood of quiet desperation evoked in those who recite them, overlook the fact that it should be perfectly possible for a faculty member to write for other journals than the few best-known outlets in his field. And experience would probably indicate that it is also possible to advance in the teaching profession without contributing regularly to the few restricted journals of specialized academic interest. To take an example from the social sciences, of the leading sociologists in America today comparatively few have published more than six articles in the official *American Sociological Review* since its founding in 1936. The figures for the *American Journal of Sociology* for 1895-47 are comparable. The social sciences are supported by a large number of lesser-known but reputable journals and magazines that offer an outlet for publication. Is the situation vastly different in other teaching fields? The range of markets for publication is probably far wider than most faculty members have ever stopped to realize. Is it not the case that many of them have simply not taken the trouble to examine the potential outlets in their own fields, not to speak of related disciplines? I am not suggesting that academicians should flock to popularize their research. But neither

should they polarize it, and before bemoaning the difficulties of publication today and the scarcity of publishing media, scholars should make sure that they have "combed the field" carefully, both in this country and, equally important, in the English-speaking world overseas.

The "harrowing irrelevancies" to which Professor Redford refers may be a part of the fiction-writer's lot. They doubtless always have been. In academic writing it has been my experience that these chance factors, arising from editorial preferences and changes, exert a far less potent influence. But for both types of publication, as every skilled writer knows, their incidence can be appreciably reduced by a careful study of editorial demands.

That there are difficulties that stand in the way of academic publication at the present time is not denied, but the teacher who wants to publish will do so, regardless of pressure for time or "harrowing irrelevancies." I agree with Professor Redford that faculty members who have a drive toward research and publication should be encouraged. Similarly (as many administrators would certainly be quick to concede) lack of publication does not imply a lack of effective teaching ability. But neither does it *ipso facto* suggest good teaching. There is no more validity in this view than there is in the notion that because a man is publishing regularly and extensively he is thereby necessarily careless and neglectful about his responsibilities in the classroom.

It is very easy to decry "pressure to publish" and use it as a cover-all excuse for lack of professional advancement. The plain fact is that good teaching does come to be known and respected, both within campus walls and beyond. Teaching that is consistently excellent brings its reward. Perhaps, indeed, those who are unfitted for or indisposed toward research and publication have an even greater responsibility to concentrate on vital and effective classroom teaching. Their efforts might in time even be able to lessen the force of the much-advertised and much-criticized pressure to publish.

OF THE SINGLE-INDEX GRADE

By FRANCIS STROUP

Southern State College

The American system of higher education has been described as an elaborate system of bookkeeping. And the most important number in the system is the single-index grade. Combined into a grade point average, it furnishes an instrument that can bring praise or scorn. It may put one on the honor roll or on probation. It may allow a student to have extra educational experiences by carrying extra units of work or it may deprive him of educational experiences such as student-body office or athletic participation. It may lead to his admission to professional school or to his dismissal from the school he is in. It may cause his deferment or induction into the armed forces and ultimately his life or death.

Surely, a number of such stature is worthy of our attention. How is it arrived at? What does it mean? The first question refers to mechanics; the second to philosophy.

There is no unique answer to either question. And to augment the complexity, the answers to one affect the answers to the other. Thus we have an equation with only dependent variables. Not only is X a function of Y but Y 's practical maximum is itself limited by X .

For the purpose of discussion let us attempt to consider a grade to be a percentage derived from a simple ratio—the number of right responses divided by the number of chances. Even such a simple process as this gives no absolute. The ratio depends on the size of the units to be compared and this decision is purely arbitrary. In a spelling test, for instance, the ratio between the number of words right and the total number of words will be far different from the ratio between the number of letters right and the total number of letters.

But suppose we consider a different mechanism. A grade can also be computed from one's position on a bipolar scale. Our

knowledge of the normal curve makes precise division of the population possible—provided the population fits the normal curve. Most grading done in the name of the normal curve not only fails to test the population for this quality but fails even to describe the population in question. Whether the population considered consists of the students of a single class, a single department, a single institution or the general population of the community will have great bearing on the marks given. And most people who are highly disposed to curve grading when it raises their mark find extremely unpalatable the statistical phenomenon that half the population of a normal curve is below average.

But even for discussion we cannot restrict our thought to the mechanical aspects of grading. Already, at least by implication, we have raised questions that require philosophical consideration. If we pursue further, we will be forced to consider other philosophical issues. Should a grade represent achievement or improvement? Skill or effort? Knowledge or attitude? How closely should it be related to the specific objectives of a single course and how much to broader purposes of education? Should it represent a prediction of on-the-job success in professional training courses? Should a formula be derived to include all of these factors?

The number of weighted combinations of these and other factors is infinite. No two people have identical concepts of the meaning of a mark. It is much the same situation as the singing army in which "each heart recalled a different name, but all sang *Annie Laurie*." We all pay lip service to a system that has a different meaning for each of us.

Why then has the single-index grade achieved such popularity? How can an instrument with no inherent value and no absolute meaning exert such influence? How can an elastic yardstick, that is stretched into different shapes by different people so as to conform to each one's idea of a best fit for an intangible pattern, provide a quantitative expression that is accepted with such finality?

Our only answer is that it is useful. In our pragmatic system it meets the ultimate criterion. It works.

For teachers it is a motivating device so potent that many have neglected to explore other means of motivation.

For students it offers comforting tangibility on an uncharted

road toward ill-defined goals. On such a journey, mileposts expressing flexible units of measure are preferable to no mileposts at all.

And for parents, the single-index grade is a time-saving gadget which antedates and promises to outlive the vacuum cleaner and the electric razor. Parents who demand full pedigrees for their dogs and horses find a single-index grade sufficient to tell them of the progress of their children in school.

RELIGION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION¹

By SAMUEL I. CLARK

Western Michigan College

The first half of the twentieth century has witnessed more ideological conflict than is to be found in the entire nineteenth century. Not since the French Revolution have ideas moved men so vigorously to action. Such conflict, when it does not reach the stage of ferocious warfare, provokes inquiry into the foundations of beliefs, political convictions, and the cultural characteristics of a people. There is nothing profound in this. When two nations are in economic conflict they look to their economic strength, and when in military conflict to their military strength. So also when in ideological conflict they look to their ideological strength. Many in America are presently engaged in this task, and one should hope that, before ideological conflict becomes so bitter that all inquiry into such matters is forbidden as sacrilegious, there be considerable purification and strengthening of our ideological foundations.

Religion is obviously a major pillar in the foundations of American culture. The country commenced as a haven for religious dissenters. The one truly recent religious holiday in the world, Thanksgiving, is an American institution. Numerous political arrangements in the country have arisen in response to religious dissidence. Religion is a constituent element in the ideological complex of America. Today it is receiving considerable attention.

Since the educational system of America is the principal instrument for transferring American culture from one generation to another, the elements of that culture are important to the American educational system. Religion is one of these elements, and particularly because of present day ideological conflict it is an important

¹ The author is a member of a group at Western Michigan College making a study of religion and teacher education for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. He developed this article as a result of his experience with the group, but it does not necessarily reflect the views of the group.

element. No adequate job can be done by the American educational system if it ignores religion or relegates it to less than its significant place in American culture.

II

Recently there has been considerable complaint that religion has been neglected in American education. Many of these complaints have come from educators. They are reliably authored. While it would be unfair to conclude that American education prior to recently has been anti-religious, it is fair to argue that educators, like most other Americans, have not until recently concerned themselves with the profounder aspects of American culture. The events of the twentieth century are goading us into reappraisals, deeper insights, and more appreciative attitudes towards the convictions and loyalties of earlier Americans. A part of this development, perhaps the principal part of it, is the current concern about religion and its rôle in education.

Schools have been accused of being excessively secular. No doubt, in order to avoid the difficulties inherent in the sectarian heterodoxy of America, there has been a strong tendency to avoid the whole area of religion. There is considerable wisdom in this course. While it resulted in the neglect of an important matter, yet it may have been the only way to have avoided endless quarrelling and total distraction from the other tasks of education. An intelligent superintendent may well have concluded that if he could not do the best job possible under ideal circumstances he would do the best job practical and confine his efforts to purely secular subjects. For the record, however, one should not neglect to note that an affinity for secular humanism has characterized the dominant educational thought of the past half century. The belief in the inherent goodness of man prevailed and was an implicit contradiction to the Judeo-Christian concept of sin and salvation. Likewise the belief in the perfectability of man by means of education conflicted with the traditional belief that vice was not the consequence of ignorance but of a certain perversity of will—often of will refined by intelligence. Many educators did not regret excluding traditional religious matter from

their curricula and substituting a non-sectarian theology or social ethics in its place. Many educators still hold to this position.

But circumstances have pushed to absurdity efforts to find a lowest common denominator in religion. Atheism and theism cannot be reconciled in some third "ism." And efforts to construct a catechism of moral and spiritual values dissociated from traditional theological thought have pointed up the inadequacy of a non-theological charity. The brotherhood of man, when separated from the fatherhood of God, becomes a Dale Carnegie society where charity is employed to win friends and influence people—in other words, a society of pleasant, mutual exploitation. The simple truth indicates that religion is too significant and integral a part of American culture to be treated in any other fashion than directly and vigorously.

III

However, there are serious obstacles in the way of a full and frank treatment of religion in the public schools. A good thing to have done is not always a good thing to do. There is a sizable body of law on the matter, and, while it is noteworthy that those who know least about this law are frequently the most vigorous in arguing that it is unconstitutional to mention God in a public school room, nonetheless the law does restrain and regulate the presentation of religious material. It does so for very good reasons, which reasons, aside from the law, urge restraint in the introduction of religious matter into the public schools. Religious intolerance is not dead in America, which means that the disposition to misunderstand religious positions is very much alive. The disposition to take advantage of a captive audience is also very much alive. The possibility of religious wrangling is also great, and probably the most serious reason of all, the average teacher's knowledge of religion and religious positions is nil.

These reasons and others, laid alongside the importance of religion, have done much to increase the popularity of the parochial school; for the parochial school is not confronted in this respect with the predicament of being unable to do a necessary task. More and more are parents sending their children to private

schools, where there are no legal impediments permitting only innocuous moral and spiritual instruction.

The public school, however, is a fixed and permanent institution in America and possessed of too many virtues to be sacrificed because of certain difficulties. Certain schools have attempted to solve the particular difficulty of religious instruction by converting themselves, during certain brief periods of the day, into parochial schools of a sort by the device of the released time or dismissal time practice. The unfortunate and dubious disposal of this practice by the Supreme Court does not detract from its merit. The fact that for the most part only the non-religious have criticized this effort to escape the no-religion situation in the schools is revealing.

Released time programs and their like also have the merit of appreciating the importance of religious leaders and the religious community in the educational process. There is a tendency for the schools to monopolize the child, no doubt as much because of the neglect of parents and others and America's great faith in schooling as due to the possessive tendencies of educators, but this should be corrected. When a child is physically ill a doctor in the community is consulted; when a child is in moral difficulty why should not a religious leader in the community be consulted? The medical profession is continuously present in the schools, preserving the health of school children. Why should not the religious profession be also continuously present? Much needs to be done by teachers and school authorities in availing themselves of the religious resources of their communities.

IV

The most serious criticism against introducing religious matter into the public school system has yet to be mentioned. It is a criticism that cannot be separated from a criticism or analysis of much current educational philosophy. Simply stated, it is a criticism of efforts to inculcate religious conviction in the young. The argument runs that it is improper for public institutions to encourage religion or religious belief when they are financed from taxation of all the people and exist under the restraint of the First Amendment (as applied to the States under the 14th Amendment)

obliging the government to "make no law respecting an establishment of Religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..." This argument gets a certain impetus from the First Amendment, but its real inspiration comes of the conviction that the rôle of education is to improve the mind with knowledge and not to improve action or behavior with good habits. Good habits and religious convictions should come from the home and the church. Intelligence and knowledge should come from the school. Consequently, while religious faith may be important, just as good behavior is important, it is not the proper function of the schools to provide it, and if it is not being provided, improvement of the home and church should be sought rather than the distraction of the school.

This argument builds itself upon the traditional concept of education as a process having to do with intelligence, knowledge, truth, and idea rather than the concept of education as a process having to do with social adjustment, cooperative attitudes, mutual understanding and, in general, behavioral virtues. The sharp distinction is between mind and behavior or, as philosophers would put it, between intellect and will.

Obviously it is impossible to concentrate on either of these two approaches to education to the exclusion of the other, but it is possible to emphasize one strongly over the other. Modern educational thought strongly emphasizes the need to inculcate behavioral virtues in the young, while older educational thought emphasized intellectual competence.

The relevance of this brief excursion into educational theory should be evident. If behavioral virtues are the principal objective of education, then any introduction of religious material into the curriculum of the public schools would be in the nature of religious behavior and not religious knowledge. Consequently, religious commitment could not be escaped. However, if intellectual competence is the objective of education, then religious material, when introduced into the public schools, would be in the nature of religious knowledge, and religious knowledge does not require religious commitment. Only in terms of the traditional concept of education is it possible for the public schools to teach *about* religion.

The recent concern about moral and spiritual values in the

public school points out that the principal concern of educators is character building and the inculcation of acceptable social virtues in the young. There is a danger in this otherwise commendable interest in social virtues which is perhaps most conspicuous when associated with religion. If religious material is introduced into the public schools for the purpose of improving behavior, then religious commitment is being encouraged by the public school. If in order to avoid such an accusation a lowest common denominator of social virtues is extracted from the total complex of religious positions in the community and presented as religion, it becomes substantially a new religion with the implicit argument in it that, aside from the moral elements in all religions, their theological content is irrelevant. Such implicit argument is unacceptable to any religion. Better to have no reference to religion whatsoever, than to refer to it in a way implicitly arguing that the ethical elements in religion are alone important.

One should not conclude that religious leaders in the country are indifferent to the ethical aspects of religion. They do seriously doubt the efficacy and adequacy of moral instruction dissociated from theological truth. There is good reason to conclude from the growing delinquency rates in America that the practice of schools in preaching a non-theological social morality (such as brotherhood weeks) is generally ineffectual. There is something truly pathetic in this mis-estimation of the complexity of man. The spiritual aspirations of man are tremendous. They are tremendous even in children. To ask the young to accept moral discipline, which frequently is strenuously restraining, for other than profound reasons, is being foolish. Children must be trained in habits of good behavior, but as they grow older their good habits need shoring up with adequate intellectual arguments lest the ingenuity of perversity rationalize to misbehavior. It is here that the religious leader feels he is indispensable.

V

Returning to our problem, if the schools cannot teach toward religious commitment, if the inculcation of social virtues is an inadequate substitute for religion and ineffectual without religion, and if religion is an integral part of our culture, what then should

be the place of religion in education? *It should be a body of knowledge about which students have a right to be informed.* Religion has a rightful place in the public school curriculum along with other bodies of knowledge. Students have a right to know about mathematics and about history. Why not about religion? Obviously it should not crowd out other disciplines, and in the primary and secondary schools it would largely appear as parts of other courses—American history, for example, or social science. There should be no discrimination for or against it. There should be no insistence that a student commit himself to a certain religious position, or argument that he should not. However, this situation is possible only when the educational process as such is understood as something other than the inculcation of commitments. If the entire educational process is understood as inculcation of attitudes and commitments, then to treat religion fairly it must also be taught proselytically, but since this patently is impossible it will only be taught inadequately, as no more than moral and spiritual values. There is no way around the fair and correct presentation of religious matter in the public schools than via a return to the correct educational theory that should prevail in the public schools.

This is not to argue that behavioral virtues are unimportant in the educational process. They are of great importance, but of an importance subordinate to the purpose of education. Just as health and sanitation are necessary prerequisites to education, so is good behavior in the classroom. Education cannot commence in a condition of bedlam or with students who are ill. Remedial efforts of schools to correct bad behavior or ill health are, therefore, wise and understandable, but they are only remedial and are not truly educational. With the growth of mass education in America this remedial work became paramount. It is no longer so important and should cease to be considered the principal purpose of education. To educate is to inform the mind and to train it in the processes of rational thought so that the mind can learn and can convey what it has learned.

VI

We have thus come to the central difficulty in the problem of

religion and public education. Instruction about religion has a legitimate place in the public school curriculum. Are the public school teachers competent to handle this instruction? The answer is "No." Probably no area of knowledge in America today is so confusedly understood as the area of religion. If public school teachers are encouraged to treat adequately of religious matters as they arise in their respective courses the consequences are apt to be ghastly. Before the student can be given competent instruction about religion his teacher must be given competent instruction about religion. This is precisely the problem of religion and the preparation of teachers. How are teachers to be prepared to give students information about religion?

Two aspects of this question deserve consideration: What in a careful sense is the nature or character of religious knowledge; and what are the difficulties inherent in teaching about religion?

Knowledge about religion is a matter of the mind, but religion is not simply a matter of the mind, nor is the "truth" of any religion simply a matter of the mind. Knowledge about religion is about "truth" that urges persons to action and commitment. To conceive of religion as sterilely academic is to grossly misunderstand religion. Religious truth is truth urging action. It is, in this sense, like the science of engineering—truly a science but a science which is nothing unless it is put into operation. Religious truth demands its practical implementation. How then can religious knowledge be presented faithfully to a student (or to a teacher to be presented to a student) without its implicitly urging the student to commit himself to it? It cannot be. There is no escaping this. Confused thought on this matter is the cause of considerable misunderstanding, for at once some will conclude that all teaching about religion necessarily is proselytic in the unabashed manner of a camp revival meeting. This is not so. A particular religious faith when correctly presented to a student must have emerging from its presentation the argument that men ought to accept it, for no religion is purely intellectual or academic. However, in describing any religious position, a teacher should not add his own urging to the urging inherent in the religious position being described. Nor should he add a contrary discouragement. Unfortunately, many are of the mind that objectivity in this matter is possible only when

irreligious cynicism characterizes the teacher. Comparative religion courses are given by instructors whose estimation of religion is only a refinement of Marx's idea that it is the opium of the people. In no other discipline would such distorted reason pass for objectivity. Be it chemistry, biology, history, or social science, the instructors of these subjects, while objective, are nonetheless sympathetically disposed towards their disciplines. More than any of these other disciplines must religious knowledge be conveyed with sympathetic objectivity. Difficulties are of course great. When will a necessary sympathy for a religious position become proselytizing? When will objectivity become so cold that it is hostile?

The unique nature of religious knowledge as truth leading to action means that the effective presentation of such truth will be influenced by the actions of the person presenting the truth. An individual presenting a religious position he does not accept is likely, through the implications of his inaction, to argue silently against the religious position, and this silent argument is apt to be more keenly heard than the favorable words articulated by him. This is not necessarily so, but it is highly probable, and its probability encourages one to conclude that, given the peculiar character of religious knowledge, the most effective way to have it objectively presented is to have each religious position presented by a person sympathetic to it.

Such persons should be strongly oriented toward the intellectual aspects of their religions. This being so, their conviction that they have the truth should hardly be an argument against their competence. If it were, then no man is competent to teach who has convictions, and impotent academic eclecticism has the field. Too often has this been a fault in education. While most of us remember as great teachers those persons who had more to them than encyclopedic minds, yet in controversial matters like politics, philosophy, and religion many of us still consider innocuity a necessary qualification for competence. Perhaps a worse error in teaching than certain misinformation about a subject is giving the impression that the subject is of little importance. The importance of religion is a fact in all religions and no information about a religion could neglect this without failing to inform properly.

VII

It is not accidental that those persons most interested in increasing community knowledge about religion are religiously committed and that those most opposed could be classed as the unchurched. This indicates obviously that there is some connection between knowledge about religion and commitment to it. It indicates obviously also that there is a connection between the maintenance of ignorance about religious matters and indifference or hostility toward religious commitment.

Knowledge about any matter always runs the risk that the knower will act in some way in consequence of his knowledge. Therefore, the only absolutely safe way of preventing religious commitment is to preserve religious ignorance. The religious community no doubt feels that, if students come to know what religion is, more of them will "choose" it. There is nothing either sinister or shameful in this, but there is something rather shameful in the contrary attitude, which is opposed to intellectual enlightenment about religion as the only sure way of preventing religiousness. Liberal education acquires its very name from the idea that by presenting all truth to persons their opportunities for choice and selection are widened, and thus they are liberated from the imprisonment of ignorance. It is proper that our schools should not indoctrinate their students with religious faith, but the possibility of an increase in religious faith should not prevent the increase of religious knowledge. After all, religious faith is not a mischievous social vice.

Quite apart from the increased possibility of religious commitments, the religiously committed are anxious to have an increase in religious knowledge as a first step to reduce prejudice and misunderstanding. All persons should be able to sympathize with this desire. It is a common experience that as we come to know more about persons, attitudes, practices, etc., our unreasoned animosities diminish. Certainly, for those persons who consider the principal purpose of education to be the maintenance of social peace, this should be a moving argument for getting instruction about religion into the public schools.

It is possible that many, persuaded of the importance of, and need for, religious knowledge, will nonetheless conclude that the task of getting some adequate kind of religious knowledge into the public schools is too difficult to accomplish. It is indeed a difficult task. Even politics does not rival religion in the intensity of feeling it arouses. This is of course a good reason why religious knowledge is necessary, but it is a discouraging reason also. Defenders of God's truth often forget all about God's charity in their zeal, and the non-religious have not even to contend with the paradox of reconciling truth with love.

Surely the first approach to the problem is to increase the competence of teachers to deal effectively with religion: by increasing their knowledge of religion and of the different religious positions; by giving them a sympathy for the religious person; and in general by equipping them with an ability to talk about religion so as not to injure or offend but to inform and explain. This is the present challenge to institutions devoted to the preparation of teachers.

THE CHICAGO ARISTOTELIANS: A PERSPECTIVE

By M. E. GRENANDER

State University of New York—College for Teachers at Albany

With the publication of *Critics and Criticism, Ancient and Modern*,¹ the philosophical and aesthetic position of the group of Aristotelian critics recently associated with the Department of English at the University of Chicago has been made clear.² The book is one which took many years to mature, and it is to me a sad fact that now, when the term "Chicago Aristotelian"³ is beginning to have general currency in the literary journals and at the national meetings of the Modern Language Association, the group is beginning to break up, some of its members have left Chicago, and the English Department there no longer has the distinctive flavor that the group as a whole had given it in the recent past.

The influence of the Chicago Aristotelians continues, of course, but it is now transmitted primarily through their writings, or is passed on second-hand by those of us who were trained there. At the annual conclaves of the MLA, recent graduates of the University of Chicago are wont—though as we, too, age, with diminishing frequency—to gather in the nearest cocktail lounge

¹ Ed., R. S. Crane (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

² More recent books and articles by members of the group further explaining their stand: Crane, *The Languages of Criticism and the Structure of Poetry* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953); Richard McKeon, *Thought, Action, and Passion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954); Elder Olson, *The Poetry of Dylan Thomas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954); Crane, "Literature, Philosophy, and the History of Ideas," *Modern Philology*, LII (1954), 73-83; Olson, "Louise Bogan and Léonie Adams," *Chicago Review*, VIII (1954), 70-87. Also helpful is McKeon's edition of *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (New York: Random House, 1941).

³ Although I have used this epithet because it is the current label, members of the group have themselves consistently refrained from adopting it, feeling that it does not do justice to certain important aspects of their work—their pluralism, interest in philosophical analysis, and concern with literary history—which are related only very generally to the *Poetics*. See Crane, *Languages of Criticism*, pp. 160, 193; and McKeon, *Thought, Action, and Passion*, p. 284.

and reminisce about the teaching techniques and the critical approaches that we use in our college classes, in Eastern, Western, and Southern schools remote from the Middle Western fountain-head. And the other day I was made aware, with something of a shock, that the influence is becoming increasingly widespread. I was talking to a young candidate for a position in the college where I teach; he had asked me what the particular critical bent of various members of the department was. I classified most of them as well as I could; then he said, "What are you?" I answered, "I'm a Chicago Aristotelian." "I am, too," he responded with interest. Astonished, I looked again at his data sheet: my memory was not playing me tricks; he had been educated at schools in California, Oregon, and Florida, and at Johns Hopkins University.

"Where did you learn that method?" I asked.

"From their writings," he answered. "I studied under a teacher at Oregon who had got interested in the Chicago critics."

All this is by way of preface to the *raison d'être* of this article. The Chicago Aristotelians have made their position as critics a matter of record, but with the dispersal of the group, I feel that some note should be made of their very distinguished achievement as *teachers*. Undoubtedly there are many better qualified than I for this task, but since my contact as a student with them ranged from my freshman year to the day I took my Ph.D., I am willing to make the attempt.

If what I am about to say sounds like the maudlin sentimentality of an old grad in his cups, I can offer in defense only that Chicago is very apt to affect its alumni that way; and perhaps in this essay I can give some explanation for the fact.

II

When I was a freshman, the University of Chicago had what was known as the "two-year college"; that is, students took courses in general education in the College for two years; then they were given the title of Associate of Arts, and went into a department for specialized work. At the end of (normally) two years in a department, they were granted a bachelor's degree. In many departments, this degree was not awarded automatically on the

completion of two years of a prescribed course of study, but under a much more highly individualized plan. No classes were required, but the degree was granted only after the successful passing of a comprehensive examination which covered the work of the department during the student's junior and senior years. Students who continued their academic training could expect, at the end of approximately one more year of satisfactory work, the master's degree, and after three more years, the degree of doctor of philosophy.

One of the four general education courses in the College when I was a student was Humanities, which I took in my freshman year, and it was at this time that I had my first contact with one of the Aristotelians—Norman Maclean. The course was staffed by a number of very distinguished—and, as it seemed to me, rather elderly—members of the faculty, together with a group of young instructors who led weekly small discussion groups and who were occasionally entrusted with lectures. Among the College students, Maclean was one of the most renowned of these younger men; his infrequent lectures, when literature was being presented, were jammed. We were all much too unsophisticated to make any judgment as to his critical approach, but his presentation was interesting, and his style sparkling, epigrammatic, and witty. (The lectures were broadcast, and it was reported in *Pulse*, the student magazine, [February 1941], that his "construction of an Aristophanic plot around the private lives of Mayor Ed Kelly and publisher William Randolph Hearst" caused "a scandalized announcer to cut his biting remarks off the air with the apology that 'the professor must be drunk'"—an incident we always hoped would be repeated.)

My sophomore year was devoted to survey courses in Social Sciences and Biological Sciences, with an introduction to a literature course which, in my sections, was not staffed by any of the Aristotelians. But classmates in other sections were fond of telling stories of Maclean's heated arguments in the corridors with other (older and more famous) members of the staff who were said to be left helpless before the onslaught of his critical arguments, and could only assert weakly that he was wrong, but they didn't know why.

It was not until my junior year, when, in accordance with the

Chicago system, I entered the Department of English (as my "field of specialization"—the Chicago term for "major") that I had any small classes with Maclean—and I made it a point to have some.

Here it becomes necessary to explain how the Department of English was organized. Shortly before I entered it in my junior year, a "New Plan" was instituted which was to make it a department of rare intellectual distinction. (New plans were introduced thereafter so frequently that, when I was an undergraduate, students were operating under the Old Plan, the Old New Plan, and the New New Plan). The program rested on four main, and equally important, bases: linguistics, criticism, the analysis of ideas, and history. All students were required to pass, at the end of their junior year, a six-hour examination in the history of English literature and the history of American literature, a provision which insured that there would be no loss of historical accuracy or breadth. In addition, a week-long comprehensive examination was given at the end of the senior year, which included two three-hour open-book examinations (partly linguistic) on set texts—one in "Analysis of Ideas" (we did Sir Thomas Browne's *Hydriotaphia*), and one in imaginative literature (we did Max Beerbohm's *Zuleika Dobson*)—and a six-hour closed-book examination based on a limited number of works selected from a published list of some two hundred titles. They ranged from Aristotle's *Poetics* to Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent," and included Darwin's *Origin of Species*, Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, *Moby Dick*, *Bleak House*, Donne's "Extasie," and numerous other masterpieces of the western intellectual tradition. In the nature of the case, only about ten of these works could actually be covered in the examination. But the catch was that no one knew what ten would be chosen; hence the conscientious student embarked, at the beginning of his junior year, on a frenetic reading campaign, and chose, with agonizing care, those courses which he thought would be most helpful in assisting him to interpret works on the list.

And what if the student were not conscientious? The English Department gave us a ruthless example of what happened to him. The first year of the New Plan, *over half* of the candidates for the bachelor's degree in English failed, and their degrees were withheld

until they could pass the departmental examination at some subsequent time. (No "make-ups" were given, of course; the failed student had to wait until the next regularly scheduled examination.) The object lesson took; the next year, an appreciably smaller percentage of candidates failed.

The inevitable consequence of this stern and rigorous attitude was that within a very short time after the institution of the New Plan, English majors became the intellectual elite of the campus—and this on a campus where intellectual prowess was the primary prestige factor.¹ Our friends in mathematics and physics (whose division—Physical Sciences—was organized along more conventional lines) looked on us with admiring eyes; when we met another student for the first time, and were introduced as English majors, almost invariably we were asked, "Oh, that's a *very* difficult department, isn't it?" (Need I say that we did nothing to dispel the aureoles which hovered over our heads?)

And it is certainly true that English was no department for the intellectually lazy or incompetent; conversely, the original and independent student was able to garner rewards which would never have been granted him in a traditionally organized department.

III

And now I return to the reason for my making it a point to take courses under Maclean. Through the undergraduate grapevine which operates so efficiently on every campus, he had very quickly become known as a teacher whose classes would be extremely helpful to anyone preparing for the bachelor's examination in English. Consequently students flocked to register for them. But registration was frequently closed before all the aspirants were taken care of. In such case, the students who had not been able to register officially for his courses simply flocked to them anyway, taking a naïve consolation from the fact that class attendance at Chicago was voluntary, and instructors never took the roll. However, since most Chicago classrooms are rather small, on the first

¹ I am reminded of a story which was current in the Middle West during my undergraduate days: When a girl hears of a new man at Northwestern, she asks, "What's he got?" When she hears of a new man at Chicago, she asks, "What does he know?" When she hears of a new man at Illinois, she asks, "Where is he?"

day Maclean's classes met an interesting situation usually developed: every chair in the room would be taken, students would hurriedly plunder chairs from adjoining classrooms, we would crowd together, and the illegal students would try to look as small and inconspicuous as possible. But even this ruse was unsuccessful, since there was a limit to how many extra chairs we could get into the classroom, no matter how much crowding we did, and by the time Maclean entered, there were usually a few students sitting on the floor or leaning disconsolately against the wall.

Maclean's face was always a study when he faced this situation. He would pause, glare about the room, scowl, and then wipe a grimace from his countenance with what we soon learned to accept as a characteristic gesture. Meanwhile, we would be sitting in a breathless silence; literally, you could hear a pin drop. Then he would say, with an attitude of Olympian firmness, "I have a class list, and unfortunately for some of you, I can count. By tomorrow, I want only those students in this class who are officially registered."

This was sheer bravado, since under the Chicago system of voluntary attendance, no instructor could—or would—flout the tradition by taking attendance. The system, of course, was a two-edged sword; a situation had probably not been envisaged by the administration in which reading the class list would be necessary, not to insure the presence of students, but to insure the absence of students who weren't registered for a course.

But the bravado usually worked. The more timid illegal students were frightened away before the next class meeting, and only a few hardened criminals managed to crowd in, and to stay.

Teaching methods among the Aristotelians varied, but most of them used the Socratic method—and woe betide the student who made careless or inept answers, or who refused to respond at all. The latter was hammered at until he was shamed into some statement, even if it was "I don't know"—an answer which was always accepted as legitimate. Students like me, who had a ready flow of words, even though they were frequently meaningless, faced a merciless ripping away of the shreds of our pretense. Many times Maclean would say to me with lofty scorn, after I had made a particularly banal response, "A safe assumption, Miss Grenander! A

safe assumption!" We learned to speak, but, more important, to think before we spoke.

It is hard to describe the emotional atmosphere which invested the classrooms in which the Aristotelians taught. It was surcharged with a taut, controlled excitement. No student ever read the *Daily Maroon* in one of those classes; no student ever fell asleep; no student whispered to his neighbor, or passed notes to the girl sitting in front of him. Our attention was glued to the instructor, the text we were studying, or the student who was speaking. We frequently volunteered information while the discussion was going on, but no student knew when he would be called upon (by name—the Aristotelians pin-pointed their students very early in the quarter), and he had better be ready. At the end of the hour, when we walked out of the classroom, we felt as if we had been put through an emotional wringer. We loved it.

Professors of Education muttered darkly about "authoritarianism" in the English Department; the English professors blithely ignored them, and the students knew the charges were untrue. As a matter of fact, the Aristotelians were probably the least dogmatic group on the campus. Time after time, when a student had made a particularly penetrating observation, an Aristotelian instructor would say, "That's a good point. I hadn't thought of it. It conflicts with what I just said, but I think you're right and I'm wrong." Frequently he would pause at this point and make a little note of the student's observation—a flattering action, particularly in view of the fact that, as I have since learned, it was not so intended. None of us was surprised, therefore, when, in spite of the Education Department's animadversions, Maclean was awarded a \$1,000 prize by the administration for excellence in undergraduate teaching. We never knew what the criteria for the award were, but we all felt that it was richly deserved.

The degree of impartiality the Aristotelians achieved in treating the texts they were discussing varied, too. One professor I had discussed for several days, with sympathy and understanding, a novel by Hardy. Then, in the last five minutes he spent on it, he came out flatly, to our surprise, with the statement that he didn't like the book: he couldn't stand the heroine, and it was torture to him to have to read about her. Maclean, however, made no

secret of his likes and dislikes. He would pause in the reading of some poem he was particularly fond of, lift his eyes to the ceiling, and say melodramatically, "Wonderful lines, my friends! Wonderful lines!" Or, faced with the necessity of discussing some work particularly distasteful to him, he would turn his head aside, pinch his nostrils together, and indicate wordlessly his disgust with the obscene stench. This highbrow rendition of "It stinks!" probably did as much to form our standards of value as his more articulate pronouncements.

The most dramatic incident I witnessed in one of Maclean's classes occurred the day a girl fainted when he wrote his literary criticism examination on the board. He had come into the room, looking, for some reason, particularly pale, wan, and impressive, and had said, very quietly, "I have told you people all quarter that you must look for key words in these critics, and you must analyze their underlying assumptions." Then, while we sat waiting with our usual air of suppressed excitement, he had turned to the blackboard and written the questions. The girl sitting in front of me looked at the board, then quietly slumped to the floor in a perfectly timed swoon.

IV

After I took my bachelor's degree, I returned the next year for work on my master's, and I began to realize, for the first time, how much sounder our undergraduate training had been than that of students from most other schools. Most of us with Chicago A.B.'s were able to complete the work for the A.M. in a year, while students from other schools often had to labor diligently for two years to acquire the background we had secured in our junior and senior years. We knew what to expect from the Aristotelians, and by the third year of our exposure to them, we were able to talk more or less coherently with them on their own terms. And we had discovered the rare excitement of an intelligent and disciplined study of literature; not having to rely on the "chills down the spine" technique for evaluating artistic excellence, we knew what we meant when we said a work was good or bad, and why we meant it.

Then came the war, and for my contemporaries, a hiatus of four

or five years which we spent in the various services. As demobilization approached, many of us decided to return to Chicago for work on the doctor's degree.

The halcyon autumn day when we foregathered once again in Gothic Wieboldt Hall was a happy one for all of us. We greeted old friends, now wearing odds and ends of navy blue, khaki, and marine green, from which insignia of the various services had been carefully stripped away, and assured each other that there was no problem of readjustment to civilian life for any of us. (There really wasn't; I discovered, in comparing notes with my veteran friends, that most of them had the same feeling I did—our freshman year at Chicago seemed more immediate to us than anything that had happened in the war years; we were back to "real life" once more.) With the aid of the G. I. Bill of Rights, we settled happily down to a bare subsistence existence which seemed like middle-class affluence in comparison with the shoestring poverty of our undergraduate days, and—oh happy thought!—at last we would have an opportunity to take courses under Crane, whose name had been held in such reverence by us during all the years we took courses under his protégés.

Ronald Salmon Crane, under whose aegis the Chicago English Department had been Aristotelianized, was, in an indirect way, himself a protégé of Robert Maynard Hutchins. Under Hutchins' presidency and chancellorship, the Dean of the Humanities Division (which included the Department of English) was Richard McKeon. McKeon, who held professorships in both philosophy and Greek, was a sound Aristotelian scholar, and his analysis furnished the philosophical basis for Crane's application of Aristotle to literary criticism.

Crane himself was a lofty intellectual of the rational persuasion. In class, his manner was considerate, courteous, remote, and detached. Paradoxically—and this is a fact I have pondered over much since the days when we sat in his classes—an electrical aura of excitement and personal involvement on the part of each student permeated these discussions. Looking back, I realize that what we must all have experienced was a galvanic response to a dramatic virtuoso intellectual performance. Crane had a knack, which I never saw duplicated in any other professor, even his most

consistent disciple, of detaching an intellectual problem from the haze of emotional prejudice and obfuscation which surrounded it, and treating it strictly on its own merits. This ability resulted in a calm and objective iconoclasm; false idols were not so much knocked down as quietly withered. And new hypotheses were constructed—not springing full blown from his head, but built up carefully and dispassionately, point by point.

He also had a most amazing willingness to change his mind, a receptiveness which, I think now, must have been the psychological counterpart of the pluralism basic to the aesthetic position of the Chicago critics. His opinions were the result of careful accumulation of data and careful analysis. If new data, or additional theorizing, pointed to conclusions differing from his earlier ones, then he followed his logic to its inexorable conclusion, even if it meant revising a theory he had formerly held, or constructing a completely different one. If, as Emerson said, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds," and if a wise inconsistency is the mark of a great mind, then Crane has a great mind. And it would be hard to convince any of us who came under the spell of him and his disciples at Chicago that such is not the case.

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Library Association (with adaptations for librarians), the American Political Science Association, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations, together with the date of censuring, are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations.

West Chester State Teachers College West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
State Teachers College, ¹ Murfreesboro, Tennessee (December, 1942, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-677)	May, 1943
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina (April, 1942, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-196)	May, 1943
Evansville College, Evansville, Indiana (Spring, 1949, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 74-111)	March, 1950

¹ Now Middle Tennessee State College.

MEMBERSHIP

CLASSES AND CONDITIONS—NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies, subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

Active. A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching and/or research, with the rank of instructor or its equivalent or higher, in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching and/or research. Annual dues are \$5.00.¹

Junior. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions and who are not eligible for Active membership. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00.

Associate. Associate membership is not an elective membership. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily

¹ Effective January 1, 1955 dues for Active Members will be \$7.50 a year.

administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00.

Emeritus. Any member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus membership. Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

Continuing Eligibility. Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

Interruption or Termination of Membership. Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year, during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

Nominations for Membership

The following 1060 nominations for Active membership and 24 nominations for Junior membership are published as provided in the Constitution of the Association. Protests of nominations may be addressed to the General Secretary of the Association, who will, in turn, transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee on Admission of Members questions concerning the technical eligibility of nominees for membership as provided in the Constitution of the Association. To be considered, such protests must be filed with the General Secretary within thirty days after this publication.

Active

Adams State College, George M. Brooke, William Turner; Adelphi College, Mildred Johansson; Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Lena V. Strode; Alabama College, Herbert W. Eber; Alabama Polytechnic Institute, William H. Coffield; University of Alabama, Harry Cohen, James H. Eads, Jr., Clifford A. Pines, William G. Gatling, Frederick L. Kelly, Jr., Melvin D. Landsberg, Clarence A. Moore, Edward D. Morgan, Jane S. Porter, Ben M. Seelbinder, William C. Stapleton, Jr., Theodor D. Sterling, Hugh L. Taylor, Harry S. Upshaw, Robert N. Whitehurst; Albany State College, Ophelia G. Andrews, John R. Crawford, Robert H. Simmons; Albion College, Elizabeth R. Hosmer; Albright College, James Reppert, Daniel F. Skeath; Allegheny College, Mary E. Brasch; American University, Sarah Baker, Robert F. Gates;

Amherst College, Jonathan Bishop, Robert Breusch, Norton Garfinkle, John B. Halsted, Edwin B. Pettet, Walter A. Sedelow, Jr., Dudley H. Towne; **Appalachian State Teachers College**, Isabel F. Jones, Joy M. Kirchner, Julian C. Yoder; **Arizona State College (Tempe)**, E. Grant Moody; **University of Arizona**, Phyllis Ball, Delores J. Belk, Fleming Bennett, Laurence A. Carruth, Arden D. Day, Florence A. Emert, Warner D. Fisher, Lutie Lee Highley, Patricia P. Paylore, Donald M. Powell, Carl Roubicek, Dorothy F. Siebecker, Lois G. Smith, John E. Thayer, Jr.; **Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Edward P. Ryan, Herman C. Steelman; **Arkansas State College**, Lillian Barton, Dean B. Ellis, Richard D. Meyer; **University of Arkansas**, Frances E. Clayton, James E. Vance, Jr.; **Army Language School**, Sidika Turner.

Bakersfield College, Joe Gorman, Edna Keough; **Ball State Teachers College**, Ernest W. Anderson, Sylvia Carlton, Porter B. Nesbitt, David L. Scruton, David W. Shepard, Edward W. Stowe, Jerry V. Tobias; **Baylor University**, Emogene Parker; **Berea College**, Carol Gesner, Faunice Hubble, Sally Wilkerson; **Bishop College**, Emanuel Sarkisyan; **Blackburn College**, Edward Lyons; **Boise Junior College**, Ruth McBirney, Robert E. Rose; **Boston University**, John T. Greene, Lester J. Murdock; **Bowdoin College**, George D. Bearce, Jr.; **Bowling Green State University**, Catherine Ellis, Lawrence W. Fox, Robert E. Hazeltine, Ruth Kilmer, Ruby L. King, Virginia Merrell, Hubert P. Stone, Margaret Yocom; **Brandeis University**, George Fischer; **University of Bridgeport**, Victor C. Swain; **Brigham Young University**, Gaylon L. Caldwell, Clawson Cannon, Richard D. Poll, R. Neal Richards; **Bucknell University**, Mark C. Ebersole, John W. Tilton; **University of Buffalo**, Noël R. Rose.

University of California (Los Angeles), Hellene N. Jensen, John H. Woodruff, Jr.; **Capital University**, Thelma I. Schoonover; **Carroll College (Wisconsin)**, Clarence Storla; **Carson-Newman College**, Werner J. Fries, Edward H. Gibson III, Ruth Harris, Elmer W. Sydnor, Lowell R. Tillett, Carl T. Vance; **Case Institute of Technology**, Bertram Herzog, Ernest B. Leach, Robert H. Welker; **Catholic University of America**, James G. Brennan, Margery E. Drake, Patrick W. Gearty, William H. Graham, Gottfried O. Lang, Joseph S. Magrath, Jr., H. Emerson Meyers, Vaclav Mostecky, John C. Oehmann, Gabrielle Rogers, Mary E. Smith; **Central State College (Ohio)**, Leonard C. Archer, Dorothy Zeiger; **Centre College of Kentucky**, Earland Ritchie, LeRoy W. Ullrich; **University of Cincinnati**, Aaron Adams, Oscar E. Anderson, Jr., Bentley B. Gilbert, Jurgen H. Roetter, James G. Sheehan, Raymond R. Suskind; **The City College**, Howard L. Adelson, Irving Branman, Marvin Magalaner, Robert Sonkin; **Clark College (Washington)**, Margaret P. Johnson, C. R. Schmitkin; **Clemson College**, John B. Howell, Jr.; **Coe College**, Leonard Schatzman; **Colgate University**, John A. Finger; **Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Lawrence R. Dawson, Richard Hopkins; **Colorado College**, Dane K. Roberts; **University of Colorado**, Wayman J. Crow; **Columbia University**, Bernice E. Anderson, Guenter Lewy; **Connecticut**

College, Alice T. Schafer; **University of Connecticut**, William Eastman, Ralph G. Eckert, Harold D. Gunn; **University of Connecticut (Hartford Branch)**, James M. Kinghorn; **The Cooper Union**, George Alicakos, William J. Burlant, Saul R. Locke, Kenneth E. Lofgren, Walter Middleton; **Cornell College**, Arthur H. Blue, Halbert F. Gates, Howard J. Thompson.

Dartmouth College, Alan R. Anderson, James B. Jones; **Davidson College**, L. Malcolm McAfee, Donald B. Plott; **Delta State Teachers College**, Ethel Cain, Richard L. Caylor, Henry J. Jacob; **DePaul University**, Harry Abrahams; **Dickinson College**, Robert A. Dentler, Lucy H. Doney, George W. Eason, J. Patrick Pattinson, Lionel D. Peterkin, M. Richard Sia, Raymond P. Stone, Irving Yaverbaum; **Dillard University**, John B. Furey, Giles A. Hubert, Paul E. Thetford, Willie White; **Drake University**, Earl E. Balthazar, Edwin L. Becker; **University of Dubuque**, Arline S. Hartel, Franklin F. LeJeune, J. Stanley Taylor, Ralph L. Towne, Jr.; **Duke University**, Robert F. Durden, William M. Fairbank, Douglas G. Hartle, Thelma Ingles, Barnet Kottler, Harold W. Lewis, George T. Lodge, Ian O. MacConochie, Lionel W. McKenzie, Henry W. Newson, Howard T. Odum, Aubrey E. Palmer, Josephine Rappaport, Robert M. Williamson, Charles R. Young; **Duquesne University**, Amor Gosfield, Lawrence J. Minet.

East Carolina College, Keith D. Holmes; **Elmhurst College**, C. Hobart Edgren, Donna Gras, Oliver M. Langhorst, Mary Anne Player, Helen M. Strong, Robert W. Swords, Eugene S. Wehrli, Herman B. Weissman; **Elmira College**, Harry S. Ditchett, Robert W. Friedrich, Marion Goddard, Joseph Golden, Mary F. Hull, Jean L. Parker; **Emory University**, Homer Edwards, Jr., Carl C. Pfeiffer.

Fairleigh Dickinson College, John P. Carolan; **Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University**, Sylvester R. Bright, Charles B. E. Freeman, Joseph E. Gibbs, Oswald A. Lampkins, Robert J. R. Largen, Andrew J. Polk; **Florida State University**, Calvin J. Billman, Benjamin H. Carroll, Jr., Martha G. Chapman, Louise Galloway, Agnes Gregory, Dorothy D. Hayes, Roy N. Jervis, Donald Merriman, Maxine S. Putnam, Sara K. Srygley, Virginia S. Williamson; **University of Florida**, Harry J. Duffy, Jr., Robert B. Marcus, Edgar A. Stewart, Jr., Paul B. Tunison, Henry M. Wallbrunn, James L. Yount; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, Leland Bartholomew, Jack R. Heather, Helen A. McCullough, Doris V. Stage, Kenneth E. White; **Franklin and Marshall College**, Frank D. Enck, Arthur E. Harriman, George H. Lane, Jr., David C. Motter, Carl F. A. Sievert; **Furman University**, Paul G. Hatcher, J. Reid Patterson.

Geneva College, David M. Carson, Paul H. Chapman, D. Ray Wilcox; **George Peabody College for Teachers**, Roosevelt Basler, Erick L. Lindman, J. Russell Whitaker, Theodore Woodward; **Georgetown University**, Thomas R. Gorman; **Georgia Institute of Technology**, Milton Chaikin; **University of Georgia**, Robert G. McPherson, F. Avola Whitesell; **University of Georgia (Atlanta Division)**, Henry T. Malone; **Gettysburg College**, Oliver W. Helmrich, Philip E. Johnson; **Grinnell College**, Madge Phillips; **Gulf Park College**, Richard F. Campbell, Roy Hudgens, Jr.

Hampton Institute, James S. Barnes, Webster Powell; **Harvard University**, James Bieri; **University of Hawaii**, Phillip S. Atkinson, Lillian R. Gibson, Anne W. Jones, Frederick B. Lewis, Jr., Edward W. Mill, T. Foster Teevan; **High Point College**, Arthur S. Withers; **Hofstra College**, Robert Davison, Robert P. McCourt, Matthew Simon; **Hood College**, Floyd H. Taylor, Marie-Antoinette Untereiner; **University of Houston**, Elizabeth Brandon, Darrell B. Carter, N. Catherine Cominsky, Mary Graves, L. Standlee Mitchell, H. Kendall Reynolds, Evelyn S. Thompson; **Hunter College**, Henry R. Kann, Louis Kleinfeld.

Idaho State College, Richard A. Behan, John J. Dering, Annette S. Lefkowitz; **University of Idaho**, James R. Baker, James L. Barrus, William H. Cone, Cleon C. Cowin, Verl G. Garrard, Leon G. Green, John J. Miller, A. Dale Robinson, Edwin W. Tisdale, William E. Wallace, James P. Wesley, Willard J. Wilde; **Illinois State Normal University**, Edna Beezley, Robert Brome, Pearl Campbell, Malinda D. Garton, Mable J. Grounds, W. Stuart Grout, Warren R. Harden, Elizabeth A. Hughes, Ila Karr, Dale L. Marshall, Ruby V. Martz, Marvin H. Platz; **Northern Illinois State Teachers College**, John S. Benben; **Southern Illinois University**, Nicholas B. Corba, John J. Schroeder; **University of Illinois**, Charles E. Ackerman, Gilberto Bernardini, John H. Byers, Grant Fairbanks, Edwin Goldwasser, Harold M. Hurwitz, Benjamin A. Jones, Max Kaplan, Harold E. Kenney, Norman Knable, Mary C. McAuley, Reid T. Milner, M. Evans Munroe, Alden C. Olson, Madhu R. Sahasrabudhe, Paul C. Silva, George C. Stone, J. Richard Suchman, George J. Suci, Wayne S. Yena-wine; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier)**, Irving D. Blum, Herbert J. Curtis, Eugene Dutton, Leslie F. Egbert, Jr., Louis I. Gordon, Roger G. Hill, Robert Kauf, John H. Mackin, Sonia Miller, Kenneth H. Murphy, John D. Ockert, Robert R. Page, George C. Ragland, William R. Rennagel, John W. Weldon; **Indiana University**, Neal J. Bailey, David Bidney, Albert K. Cohen, Robert V. Daniels, Leon H. Levy, Helen McMahon, Thurber H. Madison, Margaret Moses, Lucy C. Perry, Vivian I. Roe, Marvin L. Seiger, Hazel Shultz, Katherine Snow, Charles H. Spencer, Harry G. Yamauchi; **Iowa State College**, George H. Bowen, Richard L. Herrnsstadt, Daniel Lenehan, Richard Levitt, Gerald E. Smith; **State University of Iowa**, Willard L. Boyd, Jr., Stuart V. Canin, John Clifford, David A. Culp, John R. Ferrell, Robert Turnbull, John B. Whitlock.

Johns Hopkins University, Edith T. Penrose, John C. Whitehorn.

Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg), Bert O. Keeney; **University of Kansas City**, Jack S. Wolf; **University of Kansas**, Thomas M. Gale, Donald W. Henry, Charles L. Holt, Walter Youngquist; **Kent State University**, Lawrence S. Kaplan, James W. McGrath, Paul Oren, Jr.; **Eastern Kentucky State College**, Robert C. Donaldson; **University of Kentucky**, Clement Eaton, Charles W. Hackensmith, Ernst Jokl, Jacob R. Meadow, Alfred M. Reece, Jr.; **Kenyon College**, Bruce Haywood, Edwin J. Robinson, Jr., Paul B. Trescott.

Lafayette College, Paul C. Paris; **Lebanon Valley College**, Mary V. Bowman, Anna B. Dunkle, William H. Fairlamb, Jr., Jean O. Love, Alvin H. M.

Stonecipher, James M. Thurmond; **Lehigh University**, Samuel V. O. Prichard, Jr., Albert Wilansky; **Lewis and Clark College**, George Bishop, David Campbell, Cornelius A. Sabin; **Lincoln University (Missouri)**, Earl C. Beeks, A. Gene Besser, Donald W. McMoore, Joseph C. Marek; **Lindenwood College**, Arthur L. Kanak, Irene Van Bibber; **Long Beach State College**, W. David Sievers, Robert C. Wylder; **Los Angeles City College**, Paul R. Ferguson; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, Elaine Goben, Frances R. Pingrey; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, Bettye R. King; **Louisiana State University**, Paul L. Abel, Marie R. Allen, Clinton W. Bradford, Evelyn G. Clark, Paul D. Dirksmeyer, Arlie V. Goyne, Jr., Joseph Levinger, Kathryn E. Mullinnix, Moss Tyler; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, E. John Clark, Marie Neville, Francis J. Rooney, Richard J. Waldron, Gordon C. Zahn; **Loyola University (Louisiana)**, Lawrence L. Bourgeois, Albert J. Gelpi, Jr.

University of Maine, Gerald W. Barnes, Pao Lun Cheng, Charles O. Dirks, Philip C. Joyce, Herbert A. Leonard, Earle R. Melendy, John W. Nichols, Robert E. Olson, Theron A. Sparrow, Carroll F. Terrell, Moody F. Trevett; **Manhattan College**, George Budzeika, James M. Cahill, Albert J. Mortola, William F. Reilly, Jr., Anthony A. Ventriglia; **Maryland State Teachers College (Bowie)**, Julius H. Gooden; **University of Maryland**, Landon W. Burbage, William P. Cunningham, Alethia A. Elps, Richard A. Ferrell, Bernard Grabowski, Francis M. Miller, Herbert Schaumann, F. W. Wellborn, Leland B. Yeager; **Maryville College**, Paul J. Cooper, Ralph Moore; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Bridgewater)**, M. Frances Guerin, Annabelle M. Melville, Samuel N. Sheinfeld; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Worcester)**, Elizabeth R. Barlow, Walter Busam, John F. Eager, Francis L. Jones, Grace A. Kendrick, Paul J. McCarron, Rita M. L. Morris, Kathryn R. O'Donnell, Robert J. Patterson, John E. Sullivan; **University of Massachusetts**, Seymour Epstein, Charles F. Fraker, Jr., Daniel J. McCarthy, G. H. Mattersdorff, John L. Roberts, William H. Ross, Robert E. Will; **Memphis State College**, Percy L. Guyton, A Ford Haynes, Jr., Perry H. Howard, Dana D. Johnson, Miles B. Johnson, William L. Wilbur; **Miami University**, James E. Bever, Charles B. Forcey, James V. Mitchell, Jr., William D. Stoner, Joseph G. Wargo; **University of Miami**, Jack A. Kapchan, Mildred A. Linskey; **Western Michigan College of Education**, Lindsay G. Farnan, John R. Freund, Alice C. Jantzen, Rosalia A. Kiss, Andrew C. Luff, Don W. Nantz; **Michigan State College**, Robert S. Bandurski, Maurice C. Benewitz, Lawrence Borosage, Norman B. Brice, John T. Dorsey, Jr., James M. Elliott, Jerry W. Gaddum, Raymond Garner, Harold O. Goodman, William V. Hicks, John G. Hocking, Finley A. Hooper, Victor Howard, Mary Lee Hurt, Florence C. Kempf, Theodore R. Kennedy, W. James King, Beatrice O'Donnell, Henry Parkus, William P. Pielou, David C. Ralph, John H. Reinoehl, Harold E. Schlichting, Robert G. Scigliano, Meta Vossbrink, Charles M. Westie, Edwin Wintermute III, Hendrick Zwarenstein; **University of Michigan**, Wesley Allinsmith, Basu K. Bagchi, Maurice A. Brull, Phyllis Caulfield, Lee E. Danielson, Hans T. David, Fritzie Gareis, Henry J. Gomberg, Arthur S. Hann, Nelson M. Hauen-

stein, Leslie Kish, Miriam L. McCrea, William A. Packer, Donald C. Pelz, Lawrence L. Rauch, Edward J. Slezak, William H. Stubbins, Gordon B. B. M. Sutherland, Roy S. Swinton, Fred P. Thieme, Makepeace U. Tsao, Theodore Waldman, John P. White, L. Hart Wright; **Middlebury College**, John Alford, Laurence H. Harshbarger, C. Fenno Hoffman, Jr., Barbara Hughes, Helen E. Tanner; **Millsaps College**, Winifred W. Doane; **Miner Teachers College**, Marion E. Carter; **Minnesota State Teachers College (Mankato)**, Mary J. Metag; **University of Minnesota**, Ruth C. Stanley; **Mississippi Southern College**, William F. LaForge, **Mississippi State College**, Guy T. Peden, Jr.; **Mississippi State College for Women**, Kate T. Barton, Robert I. Gilbert, Virginia Harrison, Arthell Kelley, Asa M. Ruyle, Jr., Eugenia Summer, Sara Woodward; **University of Mississippi**, Hector Currie, Robert J. Farley, Dudley R. Hutcherson, Jesse A. McKeen, Jean G. McMurray, Kalo E. Neidert, Claire Williamson; **Northwest Missouri State College**, Gerhard W. Krapf, Earle Moss, Gordon N. Price; **University of Missouri**, Harry V. Ball, Jr., J. Leslie Bayless, Daniel E. Brady, Robert E. Bray, Theodore W. Bretz, Walter C. Brown, Ralph A. Burton, L. E. Marc de Chazal, Homer E. Dale, Clarence D. Davis, David R. Derge Jr., Nettie-Alice Doolittle, Karl H. Evans, Geraldine K. Fergen, John L. Ferguson, Peter W. Fletcher, Robert W. Habenstein, Howard F. Hirt, J. O. Keller, Hudson H. Kibler, Harold E. Mosher, Lindon J. Murphy, Peter K. New, Niels C. Nielsen, Adrian Pauw, Ruth M. Quant, Donald L. Richard, Cecil V. Roderick, Edward A. Rogge, Robert F. G. Spier, M. Elsworth Springer, Alfred B. Stephenson, Edward J. Vredenburgh, Jr., Merea Williams; **Montana State University**, Victor C. Ferkiss, Warren K. Garlington, Doris M. Stewart, James H. Straughan; **Montgomery Junior College**, Golda S. Payne; **Morgan State College**, Eugene Stanley; **Murray State College**, Pete Panzera; **Muskingum College**, Harry C. Adams, William H. Blakesley, Jay Chambers, John W. Peters, Harvey D. Tschirgi.

Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney), Don Jester; **University of Nebraska**, Wayne R. Collings, Warren E. Engelhard, Saul T. Epstein, Caleb Foote, Philip S. James, L. John Martin, Paul A. Phillips, Janet F. Schmidt, Jack R. Snider, Louis C. Trzcinski, Arthur B. Ward, Arthur B. Winter; **University of New Hampshire**, A. Melville Nielson; **New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts**, Richard D. Barron, Louis Child, Harold A. Daw, Richard H. Duncan, Warren O. Groves, Ferdinand A. Quinones, Paul W. Zickefoose; **New Mexico Military Institute**, Kenneth K. Bailey; **University of New Mexico**, Alfred C. Welch; **New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences**, Simon J. Lawrence.

State University of New York—Agricultural and Technical Institute at Alfred, Robert A. Loewer; **College for Teachers at Albany**, Richard Jongedyk, Alfred E. Kuenzli, Edwin D. Lawson, Walter G. Simon, Richard E. Spalding; **College for Teachers at Buffalo**, H. Virginia Butler, Marian L. Carroll, Gerald E. Critoph, Jean L. Eastwood, Anthony Fricano, Walter S. G. Kohn, Marguerite M. Smith; **Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute at**

Farmingdale, Leroy N. Young; **Maritime College**, Meir H. Degani, James M. Maley; **Teachers College at Fredonia**, James D. Barhydt, Helen L. Buderkin, Lloyd R. Kaiser, Helen C. McKee, Mary E. Paris; **Teachers College at New Paltz**, Alma Bent.

New York University, David H. Greene; **Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina**, Leroy F. Holmes, Jr.; **North Carolina State College**, Vester R. Brantley, Charles R. Kelley, William Leonhardt, Latham L. Miller, F. A. Nylund; **University of North Carolina**, Edward C. Curnen, Carlyle J. Frarey, Andrew H. Horn, N. K. Ordway, Frank J. Schwentker, Wesley H. Wallace, Louis Welt; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Robert G. Butler, F. Lazelle Minnear, Robert J. Roberts, Frederick G. Walsh; **North Dakota State Teachers College (Minot)**, Linnea Anderson, Jean E. Carlson, Vencie C. Elgie, James E. Kearns, Hal Pufall, Aird C. Smith; **University of North Dakota**, Charles M. Harman, Thoburn F. Peterson, Marguerite Rodgers; **Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota)**, Janet S. Jensen, Gertrude N. Miller, David F. Richmond, John W. Shepard; **Northwestern State College (Oklahoma)**, Jane W. Pinkerton; **Northwestern University**, David E. Apter, Douglas C. Basil, Rudolph C. Blitz, Donovan W. Brown, A. Leonard Diamond, J. L. Dillinger, Edward P. Dozier, Frederick A. Ekeblad, Roger D. Forseth, William J. Haskins, William N. Hughes, J. J. Lamberts, William B. McColly, Roy C. Macridis, Glenn O'Malley, Philip Pinkus, Lambert C. Porter, Armand Renaud, Louis R. Rossi, Samuel Schoenbaum, Stephen Shafroth, John W. Shroeder, Hugh B. Staples, John L. Strike, James E. Van Ness, Fred M. Westfield, A. Leslie Willson, Jr.; **Norwich University**, Philip S. Hopkins; **University of Notre Dame**, Charles B. Hands, Emil T. Hofman, Bernard J. Ward.

Oberlin College, Robert T. Kretchmar, Margaret Modlish, Jay Y. Roshal; **Occidental College**, Leland S. Babcock, Robert P. Collier, G. William Hume, Ellis E. McCune, John E. Rodas; **Oglethorpe University**, Stanley Daugert; **Ohio State University**, Donald W. Bleznick, L. C. Chadwick, Wilda G. Chambers, Kendall P. Cochran, Paul G. Craig, Willis Doney, Frederick J. Doyle, Irma Eglitis, John A. Eglitis, Justina D. Epp, William H. Havener, Erwin Kleinfeld, Margaret Koste, Bernard H. Marks, Coretta Mitchell, Elton F. Paddock, Harold B. Pepinsky, Jack H. Prince, Harry L. Reinhart, Vance L. Sanger, Frank Seiberling, Jr., George S. Taylor, Loren R. Tomlinson, Richard A. Tybout; **Ohio University**, Edith T. Aney, William W. Betts, Jr., Stephen G. Boyce, Albert S. Chapman, Oscar R. Eggers, Sherwood E. Hall, Jr., Philip F. Legler, Samuel H. Nass, Harold R. Swardson; **University of Omaha**, Frederick W. Adrian, Rex V. Call, Duane W. Hill, Alfred Sugarman, Garland S. Wollard; **Orange County Community College**, Walton A. Brown, Ralph LoCascio; **Oregon College of Education**, Ray K. Godsey, Edgar H. Smith; **Southern Oregon College of Education**, Irene Hollenbeck; **Oregon State College**, Raymond J. Agan, Marian C. Aikin, George H. Arscott, Clarice M. Barker, Elma M. Bemis, Lawrence T. Blaney, Richard W. Boubel, William H. Carlson, Emery N. Castle, Irene L. Craft, Imogene Cusac, Sigmund Eisner, Robert O. Fetvedt, William R. Furtick, Alta I. Gaynor, Katherine W. Hughes,

Lora F. Ives, Marie H. Jackson, Roger E. King, James T. Krygier, Shepard Levine, Fred F. McKenzie, Milford D. McKimmy, Louise M. Milligan, Lynne A. Pettit, William R. Poole, Doris Ransom, Jean Ryder, Stephens T. F. Shou, James D. Snodgrass, Bessie Tressler, Harriet J. Warner, Miriam Yoder; **University of Oregon (Dental and Medical Branch)**, Thomas B. Fitzpatrick, Carl E. Hopkins.

Pace College, Martin W. Wilmington; **Pasadena College**, Harvey B. Snyder; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (East Stroudsburg)**, Marvin E. Burrus, Harold F. Creveling, Josephine B. Kerns, Isobel M. Nagel, Chester A. Rininger, Gladys B. Seese; **Pennsylvania State University**, Virginia Britton, James J. O'Hara, J. T. White; **University of Pennsylvania**, Hugo A. Bourdeau; **University of Pittsburgh**, Bernice M. Berkey, Robert E. Carlson; **Plymouth Teachers College**, Norton R. Bagley, Richard Sanderson; **Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Willie E. Allen; **Pratt Institute**, Haroun Mahrous, Armando Treglia; **Purdue University**, Robert Baer, Louis J. Coe., Ralph K. Davidson, Chester Feldman, William K. LeBold, David C. Peaslete Stanley Reiter, Morris Skibinsky, William T. Stafford.

Queens College (North Carolina), Margaret L. Eley, Raymond L. Klein.

University of Redlands, Donald K. Adams, Lucille Childears, Harold D. Kirchner; **Regis College**, Mary C. Bryan, Grace A. Hawley; **Ripon College**, Walter F. Brunet, H. R. Cort, Jr., David L. Harris, George H. Miller, Robert G. Olson, Vernon L. Schonert; **Rockford College**, Britomar J. Handlon, Kathryn Turner, Jean M. Voegeli; **Rose Polytechnic Institute**, Richard H. F. Pao; **Rutgers University**, Ralph R. Shaw.

St. Lawrence University, Joyce E. Backus, George W. Doten, Clarke L. Gage, Georgia Harrah, George F. McFarland, Donald J. Newman, June L. Tapp, Alfred L. Thimm; **St. Olaf College**, Lily G. Amundson, Kenneth C. Bailey, Donald H. Berglund, Olaf C. Christiansen, Francis E. Clark, Ruth E. Hall, Amy L. Lamborn, Kenneth G. Lutterman, Rolf E. Mellby, Dolores Noll, Elizabeth C. Olsen, Owen R. Opdahl, Lylah Sanders, Elvira L. Thomson, F. Marian Walker, Robert F. Young; **San Diego State College**, Thorsten R. Carlson, Lowell Tozer; **San Francisco College for Women**, Patricia Marr; **San Francisco State College**, Robert T. Mack, Jr.; **University of San Francisco**, James H. Perryman; **University of Scranton**, Bernard J. Schneck; **Shepherd College**, Jefferson D. Caskey, Fred B. Edgell, C. J. Stevens; **Shurtleff College**, Charles E. Moulton; **Simmons College**, Frederick M. Anderson; **South Carolina State College**, Mamie E. Thompson; **University of South Dakota**, James D. Taylor; **University of Southern California**, Robert V. Gregg; **Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Jasper Turner; **Stout Institute**, John J. Kirby, Benita G. Smith, Theodore E. Wiehe; **Sweet Briar College**, Elizabeth Branch, John J. Corcoran, Dean Hosken; **Syracuse University**, Catherine S. Chilman, Charles H. Cruttenden, William P. Ehling, Richard Koontz, David O. Stone; **Syracuse University (Utica College)**, Ralph B. Fearing.

Temple University, Morton Alpren; **University of Tennessee**, Albert A. Blank, Frederick A. Ficken, Gustave A. Harrer; **Agricultural and Mechanical**

College of Texas, North B. Bardell, Jr., Randolph Blumberg, James E. Patterson, Robert R. Shrode; **North Texas State College**, Weaver K. Eubank, Jr., Ray Gough, Edwin R. Hansen, David M. Morris, Jr.; **Texas State College for Women**, Gesine A. Franke, Florence McCracken, Faye Pannell; **Southwest Texas State Teachers College**, Glenda G. James; **University of Toledo**, James L. Hofford, Maybelle Kohl, Arthur B. O'Leary, Huo-hsi Pan, Roger H. Weiss, Edward B. Wickes; **Tufts College**, Stuart U. Rich, Seymour O. Simches; **Tulane University of Louisiana**, Ralph Platou, Phylida M. Willis, Joseph H. Young; **University of Tulsa**, Simon Green.

Union College (Kentucky), William J. Grandoschek; **Union College and University**, William B. Bristol, Patrick E. Kilburn, Raymond Rappaport, Jr., Alan Roberts, William C. Stone, Gifford W. Wingate; **Union University**, Willie M. Johnson; **U. S. Merchant Marine Academy**, Lane C. Kendall.

Valdosta State College, J. Graham Wall; **University of Vermont**, Erland C. Gjessing; **Villanova University**, William J. Barnhurst, George D. Murphy; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute**, James H. Bailey, Charles A. Holt, Webster Richardson, George G. Shackelford, Hugh D. Ussery.

Washburn University of Topeka, Robert D. Johnston, Grant Y. Kenyon; **Central Washington College of Education**, John P. Allen, Harold S. Anderson, John W. Fuller, W. Irene McGuire, Wallace W. Reiff, Richard B. Reinholtz, Clifford P. Wolfsehr; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, William R. Dell, Norman Thompson; **Washington and Jefferson College**, Edward Bobko, Richard R. Martin, John A. Modrick; **State College of Washington**, Amos P. Maxwell, Murray A. Straus; **Washington University**, Luis Angelone, Willard L. Bellman; **University of Washington**, Steven D. Fuller, Robert L. Monahan, David Roberts, Victor Steinbrueck, Edwin A. Valentine, Catherine Vavra; **Wayne University**, Louis Fraiberg, Anna Jane Meshkoff; **Wells College**, Robert P. Boynton; **West Liberty State College**, O. Lee Faulkner, Ada L. Gambrell, William P. Williamson, Jr.; **West Virginia State College**, F. S. Belcher, Jr., John L. Copeland, Neal Riden, Jr.; **West Virginia University**, Joe E. Ford, Charles Norman, Betty R. Phillips; **Western College for Women**, Charlotte Key, Ruth Limmer, Zung-nyi Loh, Angelica Mendoza, Fred G. Sturm; **Western Reserve University**, Robert S. Rosner; **Wheaton College (Massachusetts)**, Rosemary C. Consavage, Richard O. Goodwillie, Lena L. Mandell, Constance E. Smith; **Whitman College**, C. W. Cassinelli, Margaret M. McConkey; **Municipal University of Wichita**, Robert V. Hamilton, Robert D. Pashek; **College of William and Mary**, Thomas C. Atkeson, Albert Mims, Jr.; **Williams College**, Bernard Lyman; **Winthrop College**, William S. Anderson, Jr., Robert K. Hirzel, Charles Raebeck, Magdalene R. Teufel; **Wisconsin State College (Milwaukee)**, Neal Billings, Lois H. Griggs, J. W. Nash, Lanore A. Netzer, Frederick I. Olson, Vera D. Petersen, Irwin D. Rinder, Marian Silveus, Gregoria K. Suchy, Raymond W. Suchy, Herman Weil; **Wisconsin State College (River Falls)**, Paul V. Peterson; **Wisconsin State College (Whitewater)**, Delmar C. Multhauf, Frieda Myers; **College of Wooster**, Charles L. Adams, Eugene Gloye, Atlee L. Stroup, Nancy B. Thomas.

Youngstown College, William Beckman.

Junior

American University, Alfred G. Obern; Dickinson College, Victoria K. Hann; University of Georgia, Gloria R. Turnipseed; University of Illinois (Navy Pier), Miriam Ginsberg, Eleanor P. Sallman; Iowa State College, Albert L. Broseghini, Richard J. Oedy, Alan G. Poorman, I. Dale Ruggles; Lehigh University, Ervin Dorff; University of Maryland, Yung Ping Chen; Michigan State College, Charles E. King, George W. Sledge; University of Nebraska, Richard K. Darr, Henry Thomassen; Northern State Teachers College, John A. Sievert; Ohio State University, Harold Stolerma; Syracuse University, John R. F. Alger, Helen B. Petrullo, Lenore Y. Taylor; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Alma L. Cudoba (M.A., New York University), New York, New York; Henry Natunewicz (Ph.D., Columbia University), Longmeadow, Massachusetts; Charles W. Pecke (Graduate work, Indiana University), Indianapolis, Indiana; Leonard M. Sizer (Ph.D., State University of Iowa), Bangor, Maine.

Elections to Membership

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election to membership in the Association of 827 Active and 38 Junior Members as follows:

Active

Adelphi College, Emil L. Dillard, Walter R. Mellen; Air Force Institute of Technology, William L. Lehmann; University of Akron, Milton L. Kult; Allegheny College, Julia Carver, Dorothy Ferencz; Alma College, Grace Nichols; American University, Eloise N. Magaw, Emmet V. Mittlebeeler, Edgar S. Robinson, Morris R. Short, John H. Smith, Ben L. Summerford, Kathryn D. Wyatt; University of Arizona, William H. Fink, Byrd Granger, Rolf Hayn, A. Richard Kassander, Jr., William R. Malsh, Daniel W. Raaf, Dwight T. Shafer, John H. D. Spencer, Thomas M. Stubblefield, Raymond M. Turner; Arkansas State College, Lewis N. Amis, Russell H. Austin, Jean Condray, John Cramer, Clarence C. Cravens, James L. Davenport, Robert L. Ferralasco, L. Lloyd Haring, Mabel R. Krick, D. Fred Pasmore, Leland W. Plunkett, Camilla Sharp, Melvin R. Sims, David G. Taylor; University of Arkansas, William C. George, Kenneth R. Stafford; University of Arkansas (Medical School), Robert L. Wixom; Army Language School, Lindberg Kao.

Baldwin-Wallace College, Donald E. Horace; Ball State Teachers College, John V. Blackwell; Baylor University, Margaret E. Beeson, Cloyd H. McClung, Donald A. Rappoport, Thomas F. Walker; Belmont College, Elizabeth Wall; Boston University, George D. W. Berry; Bowling Green

State University, Dale E. Courtney; **Brandeis University**, John F. Matthews; **University of Bridgeport**, Meta F. Williams; **Brigham Young University**, Ray R. Canning, Briant S. Jacobs; **Bucknell University**, William K. Smith; **Butler University**, John F. Pelton.

University of California, Ralph R. Canter, Jr.; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, Margaret H. Jones, Eleanora L. Petersen; **University of California (San Francisco)**, Henry H. Weisengreen; **Calvin College**, Calvin G. Andre; **Canisius College**, Rupert J. Ederer; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Sergio DeBenedetti; **Carson Newman College**, William W. Bass, John C. Brashear; **Cedar Crest College**, Marion Kayhart, Janet Stamm, Jessie E. Stark; **Central College (Iowa)**, Norma H. Richardson, Robert J. Rittenhouse; **Central State College (Ohio)**, William P. Robinson; **Chicago Teachers College**, Mary C. Cole, Louise E. Dieterle, Lorain O. Hite, Robert E. Rutherford, Arthur A. Scharf, Christy C. Shervanian, William D. Spears, Maurice Yochim; **Chico State College**, Donald P. Veith; **Cincinnati Conservatory of Music**, T. Scott Huston, Jr.; **University of Cincinnati**, William L. Carter, William B. Christ, Herbert M. Jelley, Kenneth B. Settle; **The Citadel**, Russell E. Thompson; **The City College**, Florence Roswell, Martin Sacks, Arthur Zeiger; **Clemson Agricultural College**, Arthur H. Abel; **Coe College**, Stanley J. Heywood, Warren Tracy; **Coker College**, Alvin A. Fahrner; **Colorado College**, Charles D. Bolton, Ruth T. Carter, Gerald E. Gleason, E. Darnell Rucker; **Colorado State College of Education**, Rhoda Foss; **Columbia College**, Willard Cooper, Emily B. King; **Columbia University**, Alan Grey, H. Randolph Halsey; **University of Connecticut**, Lula T. Behl, Ella A. Dye, Willys W. Folsom, Verl S. Lewis, Janet T. Tremaine; **Cornell University**, Benjamin Gebhart.

Dartmouth College, MacAlister Brown, Robert A. Kavesh, Paul R. Zeller; **Davidson College**, J. Hunter Peak; **Denison University**, Francis C. Bayley, Merle E. Brown, Alpha C. Chiang, William L. Hall, George R. Hunter, Norman H. Pollock, Jr., William Preston, Jr., Arthur P. Stabler, Frederick Wirt; **De Paul University**, Esther W. Buccieri, Loretto R. Hoyt, Magdalen Massmann, Alfred L. Papillon, Raymond H. Schmandt, Diane Wieneke; **DePauw University**, Stephen T. Early, Jr., Clinton B. Gass, Conrad Hilberry, Ruth Hochstetler, Ruth Lindsey, John E. Maher, Edward N. O'Neil, Carl E. Steinhauer; **University of Detroit**, Calvin C. Kuehner, J. Donald LaCroix; **Drake University**, Rex T. Morrison.

East Carolina College, Velma W. Lowe; **El Camino College**, Jacob H. Martin; **Elmira College**, Margaret E. Frey, John Joy; **Emory University**, H. Lawrence Clever, Jack W. Jessee, Ted R. Spivey, Neil C. Tappen; **Endicott Junior College**, Leah R. Louison, Otto R. Mauke.

Fairleigh Dickinson College, John H. Hindle, Jr., Charles Weber; **Finch College**, Roger H. Charlier; **Fisk University**, Gertrude F. Rempfer, Robert W. Rempfer, Robert P. Smith, Jr.; **Florida State University**, Lewis J. DeLaura, Charles H. Fairbanks, Robert K. Godfrey; **University of Florida**, David Lane, Richard A. Toerne; **Furman University**, Frederick C. Martin, C. Stuart Patterson.

Garrett Biblical Institute, Edward T. Ramsdell; George Pepperdine College, Milton Rickels, Woodrow W. Scott; George Washington University, John P. Reesing, Jr.; Georgetown University, Thomas F. Gearin, Robert P. Goodwin; Georgia Institute of Technology, William M. McCullough; Georgia Teachers College, Marshall Hamilton; University of Georgia, Eulala Amos, Fanny Lee Brooke, J. Fraser Hart, William M. Henderson, David J. de Laubenfels, William O. N. Scott, Porter S. Wood; University of Georgia (Atlanta Division), C. Clyde Jones, Bascom O. Quillian, Jr.; Gonzaga University, Anthony B. Corrigan; Guilford College, George G. Thielman.

Hahnemann Medical College, Morris A. Spirtes; Hamline University, Kenneth R. Doane, Lewis G. Kahn; Hampton Institute, Oscar R. E. Barker, Walter B. Hunter, Elbert Randall, John E. Spikner, Ruth E. Taylor; Harris Teachers College, Alice M. Smart; Hartford Seminary Foundation (School of Religious Education), Catherine N. Patton; Hastings College, Everett J. Lowry; University of Hawaii, L. Scott Daniel, Anne B. Zaloha; Hiram College, Mary Louise Vincent; Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Chi-Ming Hou; University of Houston, Robert L. Scott, Richard Uray; Howard University, Doris V. Evans; Hunter College, Isabelle A. Krey, Virginia M. Standt.

North Idaho Junior College, Earl W. Priddy; University of Idaho, Eugene M. Lerner, W. R. Parish, Glenn Pedersen, Leonard P. Vidger; Western Illinois State College, Lois P. Mills, William W. Ryding; Southern Illinois University, Clarence R. Jeffery, Kent Moore, Edward J. Shea, Russell F. Trimble, Jr., Robert E. Van Atta, Anita Zorzoli; University of Illinois, Mary Arbenz, Albert D. Bailey, Pauline Changnon, James Gallagher, Ladislav Goldstein, Samuel K. Gove, Bruce Harkness, Bernard Karsh, James S. Koehler, John J. Kovaly, Alfred H. Krebs, Van Miller, George S. Newell, Jr., Edward J. Scott, Robert J. Smith, John E. Wills, Stanley P. Wyatt, Jr., Jack Wood; University of Illinois (Navy Pier), Robert E. Corley, Herbert J. Grossman, Anthony R. Morici, Halina J. Presley, Joseph T. Tyree; Indiana State Teachers College, Mark E. Dean; Indiana University, Julius R. Blum, C. L. Christenson, Norman H. Deunk, Vaclav Hlavaty, Calvin C. Turbes, Piotr S. Wandycz; Iowa State College, Donald D. Dickinson, Cecil D. McVicker, Robert D. Stalley; State University of Iowa, John G. Chantiny, Herbert M. Greenberg, James W. Jones, William H. Lyle, Jr., Harry T. Muhly, Richard S. Westfall; Iowa Wesleyan College, Hans Beerman, Otis G. Carnes, James C. Hackney, Donald E. Sullivan.

Jamestown Community College, Henry J. Bridges; Johns Hopkins University, John C. Cobb.

University of Kansas City, Andrew T. Brown, Charles N. Carnes, George Ehrlich, Jane Hadden; Kansas State College, Laura Baxter, Barbara Craigie, Barbara E. Densmore, Walter H. Eitner, Richard C. Franklin, Frank P. Graham, Elmer G. Heyne, Robert M. Hutchinson, Arthur S. Krival, Arnold M. Lahti, Sara C. Larson, Fred Y. M. Ma, Jordan Y. Miller, Winnifred J. Pederson, Robert C. Pickett, James L. Rosenberg, Joyce A. Ryan, Lois R. Schulz, Eunice L. Severns, Robert L. Snyder; University of Kansas, Hazel A.

Anderson, Charles M. Baker, Kenneth E. Beasley, Frank P. Dobyns, Flora K. Ewart, John Glinka, Nicholas Hotton III, Florence F. Johnson, Muriel H. Johnson, Joyce McLeod, Edward A. Maser, Robert M. Mengel, June Miller, Laura Neiswanger, John M. Nugent William F. Shore, Elden C. Tefft, Helen A. Titsworth; **Kent State University**, George Lucht; **University of Kentucky**, Carlos C. Erwin, William M. Faucett, Sheldon Grebstein, Holman Hamilton, E. Judson Humeston, Jr., William M. Lewers, Nathaniel Patch, Marvin J. Rabin, James D. Riley; **Keuka College**, Rosemary R. Hein; **Knoxville College**, Florence L. Williams.

Lafayette College, Liang-Lin Hsiao; **Lake Forest College**, Jack V. Buerkle, Sakae Kurita, Edgar Lohner; **Lamar State College of Technology**, Howard V. Galliher, Marvin L. McLaughlin, Robert Nossen; **Langston University**, Huey J. Battles, Eugene J. Brown; **Lewis and Clark College**, George W. Ennis, Edith T. Smith, Ellen R. Stevahn; **Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)**, Sayre P. Schatz; **Lindenwood College**, Hortense F. Eggmann, Marian B. Froelich; **Southeastern Louisiana College**, Joachim Seyppel; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, Nolan J. Sahuc; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, Katherine Bridges, Louise M. Lang, Frederick M. Rosentreter, Paul Torggrimson; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, Robert L. Patrick; **Louisiana State University**, John B. Carr, Jr.; **University of Louisville**, R. Duncan Dallam, James C. Moore, Oscar W. Shadle; **Lowell Technological Institute**, J. Arthur Ainsworth, Russell L. Brown, J. Frederic Burt, Vasilis Lavrakas, John Lewis, Felix S. Palubinskas, Kenneth L. Rogers, Albert Woidzik.

McMurry College, Andrew W. Hunt; **Macalester College**, L. Calista Olds; **Madison College**, William L. Mengebier; **Manhattan College**, Joseph A. Marano, Ernest V. Speranza; **University of Maryland**, Arthur M. Ahalt, Louis G. Austin, Richard Hendricks, Wilhelmina F. Jashemski, Thomas W. Kiah, LeRoy L. Lee, Ralph H. Long, Jr., William A. Lybrand, Dolores L. Pierson, Robert D. Rappleye, John J. Sciarra, S. F. Singer; **Maryville College**, Carolyn L. Blair; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Boston)**, Mary C. Donahue, M. Harvey Read, James D. Ryan, Vincent J. Tringale; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Bridgewater)**, Elizabeth M. Cirino; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Lowell)**, Fortunata Caliri, Ignatius A. Ciszek, John R. Fitzgerald, James M. Ryan; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Salem)**, Joseph A. Sullivan; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Worcester)**, Madelin A. Wilmarth; **Memphis State College**, Walter R. Smith; **Mercy College**, Dora J. Gunderson, Sister Mary Justine, Mildred M. Sanders, E. Juliana Thomson, Walter H. Thomson; **University of Miami**, Clifford C. Alloway, Joel Belov, Lulu L. Cadle, Charles E. Capel, Thelma Cohen, Samuel Ersoff, James A. Gould, Raymond E. Hartley, Robert W. Hively, Joseph J. Hurwitz, Richard Janaro, W. Henry Leigh, Catherine E. Lemma, Dominique-René S. de Lerma, Edward F. Menerth, Jack L. Radomski, Philipp R. Rezek. Ann S. Rice, H. John Ross, Edwin Smith, Alma Williams; **Central Michigan College of Education**, Marilyn Williams; **Michigan State College**, Joseph G. Dzenowagis, Norman F. Keiser, Margery R. Ross; **Michigan State Normal**

College, George E. Martin; **University of Michigan**, Leigh C. Anderson, Edward M. Anthony, Jr., J. Willcox Brown, William G. Dow, Elizabeth A. H. Green, Frank Harary, Max Loehr, George E. Mendenhall, Wilbur B. Quay, Harold L. Wilensky; **Millsaps College**, Arnold Ritchie; **Miner Teachers College**, Ruth L. Kemp; **Minnesota State Teachers College (Mankato)**, Earl Myers; **University of Minnesota**, Robert L. Bliss, Stanley Bruckenstein, Joan Gordon, Robert C. O'Hara, Robert M. White; **University of Minnesota (Duluth Branch)**, Merle L. Bryant; **Mississippi Southern College**, Raymond M. Ainsley, John H. Allen, Sam DiBonaventura, James R. Johnson, Jr., John M. King, Sam B. Tidwell; **Mississippi State College**, Herbert A. Aurbach, Douglas C. Bain, Paul T. Blair, Chester F. Chapin, Walter E. Freeman, Clinton H. Graves, Jr., Everett B. Hollingsworth, L. D. Welch; **University of Mississippi**, Joseph B. Baldwin, Allen T. Barr, George P. Champion, Arthur B. Custy, Clara M. Eadler, James G. Hilton, Ira D. Hogg, F. Ray Marshall, Edna R. Roberts, George Vaughan; **Southwest Missouri State College**, William J. Husa, Jr.; **University of Missouri**, Daniel A. Bradley, Edwin A. Christ, Joseph E. Flynn, Mary E. Kirk, Stuart O. Landry, Wayne A. Leeman, Donald L. Shawver, Hugh E. Stephenson, Jr., Jesse H. Wheeler, Jr.; **Monmouth College**, Elwood H. Ball, James P. Dunn; **Montana State College**, James L. Simpson, Sidney A. Whitt; **Montana State University**, James E. Short; **Mt. Holyoke College**, Kathleen M. Lynch, John Schaar; **College of Mount St. Vincent**, Arthur F. Murphy.

Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne), Rex A. Conner, David M. Dennis, Homer C. Kelley; **University of Nebraska**, Keith H. Christensen, Don Kanel, Bernard Kreissman; **New Mexico Military Institute**, Merton L. Dillon, Patrick H. Gratton; **University of New Mexico**, John P. Anton; **New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences**, Richard F. Grego, Israel Kugler, Lester C. Singer.

State University of New York—Teachers College at Geneseo, John McKiernan; **Teachers College at Oneonta**, Bernard F. Joslin.

New York University, John L. Donovan, Lawrence H. Leder, Herbert Weinfeld; **Newark College of Engineering**, John O. Predale; **Newberry College**, J. Benjamin Bedenbaugh, M. Foster Farley, Jack L. Peterson, Claridge W. Summer; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Latis M. Campbell; **North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering**, M. Mason Gaffney, E. L. Miller, Jr.; **University of North Carolina**, E. Earl Baughman, Margaret B. Dolan, Austin B. Williams; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina**, Pascal Biagini, Coy T. Phillips; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Avinoam Dafni, Ruth Goecke; **Northwestern University**, C. Murphy Combs, Harold T. McCarthy; **University of Notre Dame**, Richard E. Ball, Walter G. Becker, Frederick J. Crosson, John T. Croteau, Joseph M. Duffy, Jr., Paul J. Morin, Roger P. Peters, James F. Ragan, Elias Schwartz, G. Herbert True.

Oberlin College, Lawrence L. DeMott, Robert B. Lloyd, Helen L. Merson, Jack R. Moeller, Paul F. Schmidt, Maurice R. Stein; **Oglethorpe University**, Martin L. Abbott; **Ohio State University**, Nathan S. Fechheimer, Stanley T.

Lewis, William Molnar, Andrew M. Sessler, Robert W. Wagner; **Ohio University**, George T. LeBoutillier; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Bess Allen, George B. Thurston; **Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Guy B. Massey; **Northeastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, W. C. Gibson; **University of Oklahoma**, K. Keith Innes, William J. Lnenicka, Sarah R. Richards; **University of Omaha**, William E. Green, Francis M. Hurst, Thadeus C. Johnston, Frank M. Paulsen, Kathryn Schaa; **Oregon State College**, Leo A. Sciuchetti; **University of Oregon**, M. Mason Gaffney, Paul K. Rowan, Lester G. Seligman; **Ottawa University (Canada)**, Pietro B. Bragato.

Pacific Lutheran College, Herbert M. Axford, R. Byard Fritts, Gordon Gilbertson, Marvel K. Harshman, Raymond A. Klopsch, Erich C. Knorr, John Kuethe, Ottilie E. Little, Frederick L. Newnham, Robert C. Olsen, Anders W. Ramstad, Kelmer N. Roe, J. Emil Running, Theodore C. Sjoding, Kristen Solberg, Karl E. Weiss; **Pennsylvania Military College**, A. Groff Alderfer, Dean B. Arnold, J. Leslie Ellis, J. Wilson Graham, Claude B. Helms, Ai-Shen M. Lee, Homer Nearing, Jr., Joseph J. Storlazzi; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Bloomsburg)**, Edna J. Barnes; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (California)**, Louise A. N. Garrett; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Edinboro)**, Wellington B. Gray, V. Frederic Koenig; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Kutztown)**, Henry R. Casselberry; **Pennsylvania State University**, Earnest E. Baer, Ernest W. Callenbach, Janet Cranston, Edward Dawson, Charles A. Engle, Louis Haller, Carroll L. Key, Jr., William J. Leiss, George B. Lott, Leonard F. Miller, Norman B. Miller, Joseph Paterno, Douglas Schultz, Coy N. Shellito, Albin E. Tacelosky, Sever J. Toretti, Donald J. Watkins, Alexander G. Wilcox, Everett M. Winslow; **University of Pennsylvania**, John P. Horlacher; **Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science**, Nathan Back, Warren Chernick, Paul S. Guth; **University of Pittsburgh**, Joseph D. Feldman, Edwin R. Fisher; **Plymouth Teachers College**, George B. Salmons; **Pomona College**, Joel Greenspoon; **Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Mabel N. Jones; **Princeton University**, Charles W. Slack; **University of Puerto Rico**, Celso R. Garcia, Lloyd Suttell; **College of Puget Sound**, Edwin H. Olson, Jr., Frank N. Peterson, Donald A. Wolvers; **Purdue University**, J. H. B. Kemperman, Harold L. Michael.

Queens College (New York), Max K. Hecht.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Paul Mountjoy, Catharine Murphy; **Rhode Island College of Pharmacy**, Monte Konicov; **University of Rhode Island**, Thomas A. Gullason, John P. Hatch, Shirley Hogan, Robert W. McCreanor; **Rice Institute**, John J. W. Rogers; **University of Rochester**, Stanley R. Glasser; **Rockford College**, Doris E. Pullman; **Rose Polytechnic Institute**, Robert D. Strum; **Rutgers University (Newark Colleges)**, Marie H. G. Charlier, Sarah C. McGinniss, Bettjean Schmucker.

St. John's University (New York), C. J. DeCotiis; **St. Lawrence University**, Robert E. Butts, Donald C. Peckham; **St. Louis University**, Alfred T. Kornfield; **St. Olaf College**, John E. Horne; **San Antonio College**, Truett L.

Chance; **San Diego State College**, Katherine E. Corbett; **San Francisco College for Women**, Elmer T. Gelinas; **San Jose State College**, F. Albert Ellis; **University of Santa Clara**, Robert H. Nau; **Santa Monica City College**, Oliver V. Anderson, Margaret F. Baird, John E. Bowles, Jr., Frank W. Breen, Pearl M. Follmer, William W. Jones, Glenn C. Martin, Roy C. Pierce, William J. Thacker, Robert P. Woods; **Seton Hall University**, Eileen A. Grindle, Dorothy L. McLeod, Dorothy Ozimek, Jeannette F. Plutnicki; **Shepherd College**, Charles R. Atherton; **Simmons College**, Henry J. Halko; **Simpson College**, Fredrick J. Lotspeich; **University of South Carolina**, George M. Reeves, Jr., Herbert C. Rudman; **South Dakota State College**, Richard Foskett, Guilford C. Gross, J. Howard Kramer, Joshua F. Robinson, Winston K. Ullman; **University of South Dakota**, Benton W. Buttrey, James S. Findley, John P. Green, Rollo Handy, Cecil Kipling, Jr., Herbert G. Lee, Gottfried I. Moller, Fred J. Petersen, Raymond M. Schroeder; **University of Southern California**, Carl M. Franklin; **Southern State College (Arkansas)**, Thomas W. Cleek, Katie Grant, Shirley Gear, Dorothy G. Lewis, Lois E. Nichols; **Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Clarence H. Hamilton; **Stanford University**, Kenton L. Chambers, Paul DeH. Hurd, Myra Keen, David G. Ravenhall, Michael Wyatt; **Sweet Briar College**, Ethel Ramage, Sarah T. Ramage; **Syracuse University**, Norman Balabanian, Catherine Conant, Philip E. Davis, Beaumont Davison, Cyrus Derman, William S. Hart, Walter G. Kell, Parker LaBach, G. Norman Laidlaw, Franklin E. Morris, Charles D. Smith, Raymond F. Valenti, Matthew J. Wayner, Jr., Katherine D. Wylie; **Syracuse University (Utica College)**, J. Kenneth Donahue, Andrew A. Pirigyi. **University of Tampa**, Benjamin F. Scherer; **Taylor University**, William D. Green; **Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University**, Thomas E. Poag; **East Tennessee State College**, Ruben L. Parson; **Middle Tennessee State College**, Ralph E. Dunham; **University of Tennessee**, Clark E. Corliss; **Texas Southern University**, Stanley V. Wright; **North Texas State College**, Reginald V. Holland; **Texas Technological College**, Jack J. Delaney; **University of Texas**, J. Frank Elsass, Jessie H. Haag; **University of Texas (Dental School)**, Ernest Beerstecher, Jr., Henry Browning, Lorna J. Bruning, Romaine Bruns, Earl G. Hamel, Jr., Edward C. Hinds, Arthur Kirschbaum, Leon Kraitz, Ralph R. Langner, Judith Marston, John F. Meklas, William E. Morrison, James D. O'Farrell, James L. Rout, Carol M. Volkmann, Bernard L. Yollick; **University of Toronto**, Maria T. Wishart; **Trinity College (District of Columbia)**, Senta-Stephanie Rogers, Eva J. Ross, Eileen C. Treacy; **Trinity University**, Frances M. Carp; **Tufts College**, Lore Halm, A. Stafford Metz, Alice L. Palubinskas, George L. Sames, Kenneth Sheldon; **Tulane University of Louisiana**, Leland Brown.

U. S. Merchant Marine Academy, Ralph L. Brady; **U. S. Naval Postgraduate School**, Roderick K. Clayton, G. Robert Giet, William W. Hawes, Sydney H. Kalmbach, Cecil D. G. King, Herbert L. Myers, Norman L. Oleson; **Utah State Agricultural College**, Basil C. Hansen, Dorothy B. Lewis, Gene H. Linford, Helen Lundstrom, S. Ross Tocher; **University of Utah**, Joseph Shelley.

Vanderbilt University, Ernest A. Jones; Vassar College, Harold D. Webster; University of Vermont, Helen M. Brazner, Martha M. Caldwell, Mona E. Gustafson, Ephraim Woll; Villanova University, Cyrus Sharer; Medical College of Virginia, Louis A. Leone, Margot Trimble; Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Radford College), Robert A. Wood; Virginia State College, Adolphus J. Miller; University of Virginia (Mary Washington College), Rosemary H. Herman, Sidney H. Mitchell.

Wagner Lutheran College, Murvel E. Annan, John Bainbridge, Joseph A. Johnston, Susette L. Myer; Wake Forest College, Chauncey B. Ives; Washburn University of Topeka, Kathleen Fajen, Marie L. Lafferty, Edwin P. Marks; Eastern Washington College of Education, Jack E. Carter, J. Kenneth Markwell; State College of Washington, B. Rodney Bertramson, Claude B. Cross; University of Washington, Sidney S. Culbert, Thomas R. Nilsen, William L. Challert, Gerald D. Stibbs, Wayne Thornburg; Wayne University, Nathaniel Champlin, Peter Donchian, Edgar G. Johnston, J. Wilmer Menge; Wells College, Raymond Jaffe; Wesleyan University, Michael Cherniavsky; West Virginia University, H. Sinclair Tait; Western College for Women, Frederick Hung, Dietrich R. Kurrer, Ruth C. Lakeway, Anita L. Martin; Western Maryland College, Ralph B. Price; Western Reserve University, Carlotta H. Agerter, George W. Albee, Ruth I. Brown, Rudolph Cardona, Raymond P. Chaty, Anna L. Edwards, K. Elise Fitzpatrick, Darhl Foreman, Martha Gustafson, Anne E. Kingsbury, Norma Kolthoff, Esther Leihgeber, John McCarthy, Isabel Merrill, Robert E. Reeves, Jane E. Wynn; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), George Y. Bijjani, Sherod M. Cooper, Jr., Frances V. Henry, Joseph M. Hopkins; Municipal University of Wichita, George D. Goodrich, Max Richards; Wilkes College, Stanko M. Vujica; Willamette University, Chester Kaiser; College of William and Mary, Ralph E. Alston, Catherine A. Edmondson, Ronald D. Emma, Lewis A. Foster, Jr., Stephen P. Paledes, Edwin J. Swineford; Wisconsin State College (Superior), Orville G. Manion; University of Wisconsin, Ralph Thomlinson; Wofford College, George C. S. Adams; University of Wyoming, Robert Trefz.

Yakima Valley Junior College, Charles Hilton; Yale University, Robert E. Cooke, Albert J. Solnit.

Transfers from Junior to Active

University of Bridgeport, David M. Silverstone; College of Idaho, E. W. Pfeiffer; University of Maine, Francis G. Shaw; Miami University, Samuel A. Yorks; Michigan State College, Thomas M. Weiss; University of Michigan, Arthur W. Forbes; University of Minnesota, William A. West; Washington University, J. Carter Murphy.

Junior

University of Cincinnati, Joan Garside; De Paul University, Helene M. Kearney; Florida State University, Ann Opalak; George Washington University, Robert Christiansen; Georgetown University, Benjamin B. Weems;

Loyola University (Illinois), Robert F. Medina; University of Miami, Robert R. Gray, John McDonald, Edward Singer; University of Michigan, Robert F. Croll; Pennsylvania State University, Mary A. Gorman; University of Rhode Island, Erwin C. Zipse; South Dakota State College, Leonard Benning; Syracuse University, Michael Alssid, Mary Jo Bradford, William Debbins, Delbert R. Gardner, Jack C. Gray, Robert W. Gray, Barry L. Logan, Edward G. McGrath, Lester J. Marks, Charles R. O'Donnell, D. Gordon Rohman, Albert M. Serling, Lionel R. Sharp, William B. Shore; Vanderbilt University, Kenneth W. Davis; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Quincy Adams (Ph.D., American University), Washington, D. C.; Harrie L. Bleecker, Jr. (M.B.A., University of Michigan), Livonia, Michigan; Louis J. Broussard (Ph.D., University of Texas), Detroit, Michigan; Carmen C. Decker (Graduate work, Indiana University), Sterling, Kansas; John C. Diegelman (Graduate work, De Paul University), Lockport, Illinois; William G. O'Hare, Jr. (Graduate work, University of Texas), Austin, Texas; Rada Rarick (M.S., Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College), Goodwell, Oklahoma; Arthur H. Richardson (M.S., Purdue University), Elmhurst, New York; William E. Rutherford (Graduate work, Bradley University), Lockport, Illinois; Harry R. Stelling (M.A., University of Illinois), Angola, Indiana.

INDEX TO THE BULLETIN

Volume 40, 1954¹

A

Academic Freedom, *G. R. Morrow*, 4 529

Academic Freedom, Harvard University and, 1 9

"Academic Freedom" Opened My Eyes, *William Kostka*, 2 189

Academic Freedom and Tenure, The 1915 Declaration of Principles, 1 90; Report of Committee A for 1953, *W. T. Laprade*, 1 62; Statements of Principles, 1 81

Academic Retirement, Statement of Principles, 1 88

Address of Welcome, *T. R. McConnell*, 1 41

Alumni—Your Former Students, *E. T. Stewart, Jr.*, 2 253

American Intellectual as Black Sheep and Red Rover, *The, Wilson Record*, 4 536

Annual Meeting, The Fortieth [1954], *R. E. Himstead*, 1 113;—Addresses, Address of Welcome, *T. R. McConnell*, 1 41; The Vigilantes, *F. B. Millett*, 1 47;—Forty-first, 3 480

Anderson, Sylvia F., Why Don't I Do Research? 3 472

Are Our Teachers Afraid to Teach? *R. M. Hutchins*, 2 202

Association's New Officers, *The*, 1 5

B

Bartlett, Philosopher and Friend, *J. A. Schufle*, 2 308

Blake, John A., The Master Teacher—A New Type of Specialist, 2 239

Blewett, Edward York, A Dean Goes to Heaven? 2 216

Bowdoin College Chapter of American Association of University Professors, Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom of, *The*, The Teacher and Authority, 4 614

C

Censured Administrations, 1 61, 2 328, 3 502, 4 667

Chicago Aristotelians: A Perspective, *The, M. E. Grenander*, 4 657
Clapp, Harold L., The Stranglehold Revisited, 2 291

Clark, Samuel L., Religion in Public Education, 4 646

Committee Reports—Academic Freedom and Tenure, *W. T. Laprade*, Chm., 1 62;—1954 Nominating Committee, 3 482

Confession of an Ex-Chairman, *R. B. MacLeod*, 3 424

Concerning Association Business, 2 324

Constitution, 1 125

D

Dean Goes to Heaven? *A, E. Y. Blewett*, 2 216

Dear Old Golden Rule Days, *Paul Elmen*, 3 393

¹ Issue number in Italics, pages in Roman; i.e., 1 107.

E

- Elmen, Paul, *Dear Old Golden Rule Days*, 3 393
Ends of Education, The, H. P. Woodward, 3 432

F

- Financing College for Faculty Children, F. P. King, 3 401
 For an Era of the Unanticipated, S. A. Nock, 2 209

G

- Gordon, Milton M., *Social Class and American Intellectuals*, 4 517
 Grampp, William D., *A Standard of Occupational Equivalence for Academic Salaries*, 1 18
 Greenough, William C. and F. P. King, *Your Retirement Security—The New OASI and Retirement Plans*, 3 357
 Grenander, M. E., *The Chicago Aristotelians: A Perspective*, 4 657

H

- Harvard University and Academic Freedom, 1 9
 Holladay, James, *The Rôle of Regional Meetings in the Work of the Association*, 3 445
How to Escape Teaching Composition, J. C. Sherwood, 2 282
 Hutchins, Robert M., *Are Our Teachers Afraid to Teach?* 2 202

K

- King, Francis P., *Financing College for Faculty Children*, 3 401;—and W. C. Greenough, *Your Retirement*

Security—The New OASI and Retirement Plans, 3 357

- Kostka, William, *"Academic Freedom" Opened My Eyes*, 2 189
 Kuhlman, John W., and M. L. Pye, *Of Teachers and Taxes*, 4 611

L

- Laprade, William T., *Academic Freedom and Tenure, Report of Committee A for 1953*, 1 62

M

- Master Teacher—A New Type of Specialist, The, J. A. Blake, 2 239
 McConnell, T. R., *Address of Welcome*, 1 41
 MacLeod, Robert B., *Confession of an Ex-Chairman*, 3 424
 Mehl, Walter J., *Student Life in Baghdad*, 4 606
 Meiklejohn, Donald, *The Teacher as Informer*, 2 269
 Membership, *Classes and Conditions—Nominations and Elections*, 1 159, 2 329, 3 489, 4 668; *Distribution of—*, 1 135; *Record of—for 1953*, 1 158
 Millett, Fred B., *The Vigilantes*, 1 47
 Morrow, Glenn R., *Academic Freedom*, 4 529
 Murray, Robert K., *The "Technical" Art of Manuscript Reporting*, 4 631

N

- Nock, Samuel A., *For an Era of the Unanticipated*, 2 209
 Not Too Humble Remonstrance Against Illiberality in Education, A, Blair Rouse, 1 36

O

- Of the Single-Index Grade,
Francis Stroup, 4 643
- Of Teachers and Taxes, *M. L. Pye*
and *J. W. Kuhlman*, 4 611
- Orientation Practices for New
College Faculty Members, *R. O.*
Stripling, 4 555
- Otis, Jack, Some Problems in the
Provision of Psychotherapeutic Ser-
vices in Institutions of Higher
Learning, 3 456
- Owen, John E., This Pressure to
Publish, 4 638

P

- Pye, Malcolm L., and J. W.
Kuhlman, Of Teachers and Taxes, 4
611

R

- Record, Wilson, The American
Intellectual as Black Sheep and Red
Rover, 4 536
- Religion in Public Education, *S. I.*
Clark, 4 646
- Ridicule and Other Detriments to
Effective Teaching, *Virginia Voeks*, 4
621
- Rôle of Regional Meetings in the
Work of the Association, *The, James*
Holladay, 3 445
- Rouse, Blair, A Not Too Humble
Remonstrance Against Illiberality in
Education, 1 36
- Rouverol, William S., The Tutorial
System, 4 593

S

- Schuffe, Joseph A., Bartlett, Phi-
losopher and Friend, 2 308

- Scholars and Schoolmen, *Marten*
ten Hoor, 3 375
- Sherwood, John C., How to Escape
Teaching Composition, 2 282
- Shilen, Ronald, Study Grants in
Liberal Adult Education, 2 226
- Simonini, R. C., Jr., The Uni-
versities of Italy, 4 563
- Social Class and American Intel-
lectuals, *M. M. Gordon*, 4 517
- Some Problems in the Provision of
Psychotherapeutic Services in In-
stitutions of Higher Learning, *Jack*
Otis, 3 456
- Standard of Occupational Equiva-
lence for Academic Salaries, *A, W. D.*
Grampp, 1 18
- Stewart, Ernest T., Jr., Alumni—
Your Former Students, 2 253
- Stranglehold Revisited, *The, H. L.*
Clapp, 2 291
- Stripling, Robert O., Orientation
Practices for New College Faculty
Members, 4 555
- Stroup, Francis, Of the Single-
Index Grade, 4 643
- Student Life in Baghdad, *W. J.*
Mehl, 4 606
- Study Grants in Liberal Adult
Education, *Ronald Shilen*, 2 226
- Syrkin, Marie, Youth and Lady
Macduff, 2 317

T

- Teacher and Authority, *The, Re-*
port of the Committee on Academic
Freedom of the Bowdoin College
Chapter of the American Association
of University Professors, 4 614
- Teacher as Informer, *The, Donald*
Meiklejohn, 2 269
- "Technical" Art of Manuscript
Reporting, *The, R. K. Murray*, 4 631

ten Hoor, Marten, Scholars and Detriments to Effective Teaching, 4
Schoolmen, 3 375 621

This Pressure to Publish, J. E.
Owen, 4 638

Tutorial System, The, W. S.
Rouverol, 4 593

U

Universities of Italy, The, R. C.
Simonini, Jr., 4 563

V

Vigilantes, The, F. B. Millett, 1 47
Voeks, Virginia, Ridicule and Other

W

Why Don't I Do Research? S. F.
Anderson, 3 472

Woodward, Herbert P., The Ends
of Education, 3 432

Y

Your Retirement Security—The
New OASI and Retirement Plans,
W. C. Greenough and F. P. King, 3 357

Youth and Lady Macduff, Marie
Syrkin, 2 317

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. Factual data and expressions of personal preference in these notices are published as submitted. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish names and addresses or to use key numbers.

Letters in response to announcements published under key numbers should be sent to the Association's central office for forwarding to the persons concerned. Address in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Vacancies Reported

Biology, Commerce, Science Education, Journalism, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physics, Public Administration: Instructorships and professorships, American University of Beirut, Lebanon, and Robert College, Turkey. Apply Near East College Association, 40 Worth Street, New York 13.

English: Instructor or assistant professor, USAF Institute of Technology. Starting salary, \$5060-\$5940 per annum. Ph.D. degree preferred. The position would be primarily in teaching engineers the processes of oral and written communication. Employment will be effected in accordance with Civil Service regulations. Applications should be made by letter to the Dean, Resident College, USAF Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio.

Mechanical Drawing, Descriptive Geometry and Mechanics or Physical Science or Mathematics: Instructor, junior college. Send applications to E. A. Habel, 741 West Mallory, Pensacola, Florida.

Physical Education for Women: Two positions, requiring M.A. and some experience, for teaching major and service courses in Midwestern, coeducational, liberal arts college. Salary and rank open. V 1351

Physicist: For research and development programs, with emphasis on scope, aim, and status of basic and applied physics programs. Prerequisites: Ph.D. and experience in research or industrial laboratory. Salary according to candidate's training and experience, \$5940-\$8040. Send applications (Form 57) to: J. G. LeSieur, Jr., Chief, Government Personnel Branch, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Physics: Associate Professor, to teach introductory physical science and physics, beginning September, 1955. Research encouraged. Age, under 35; Ph.D. preferred; 2 years' teaching experience. Salary, \$5226, 5 annual increments to maximum of \$6396. Write to: Dr. Donald S. Allen, Chairman, Division of Natural Science, State University Teachers College, New Paltz, New York.

Teachers Available

Administration: Man, 32, Ed.D. Total of 9 years' administration and teaching experience at the university level. Graduate majors in educational administration and higher education. Recent experience includes administration of 2-year

university programs. Desire a position as dean of a 2-year college or university division with the possibility of some professional education work. Available fall, 1955. A 4941

Administration: Experienced college teacher, department head available for position of division or general administrator. Man, 39, married, Ph.D.; professional and research publications in psychology, educational theory, and philosophical fields. Experience in group and conference work. Available September, 1955. A 4942

Administration—Bursar, Controller: C.P.A. (Mass.). Man, 45, 1 child, European Doctor of Law degree, presently employed in public accounting firm, desire college or university administration position with possibly some teaching of accounting. 12 years' experience in business and industry, 4 years in legal research. Wife, Ph.D. in biostatistics, former Fulbright and Harvard University research fellow, publications, 3 years' college teaching, available for part-time teaching or research in biology or statistics. Available June or September, 1955. A 4943

Administration—Dean of Fine Arts: Man, 36, married, 1 child, Ph.D. Total of 10 years' teaching experience and supervisory work in college and university. Member of A.A.U.P., College Art Association of America, Phi Delta Kappa, Sigma Delta Pi, National Art Education Association. Listed in *Who's Who in American Art*. Publications. Desire opportunity at administrative level to utilize interest and experience in widespread academic fields. Available summer or fall, 1955. A 4944

Administration, English: Man, 39, married, 4 children. Ph.D., Harvard. 14 years' college teaching experience; 2½ years as assistant dean in liberal arts college. Have taught both English and American literature; special fields: the novel, Victorian literature. Several scholarly articles; 4 books published, 1 in press. A 4945

Administration or German: Man, 38, married, 1 child. Ph.D., University of North Carolina. 10 years' teaching experience in college and university. At present Associate Professor of German in outstanding Southern college. Desire position as Dean of Men or head of German Department in Eastern college or university. Excellent references. A 4946

Art: Man, 23, single. B.F.A., M.F.A. *magna cum laude* (painting and illustration), Syracuse University. 2 years' teaching experience, design, drawing, and fashion illustration. Able to handle courses in lithography, painting, jewelry, composition, illustration, lettering, advertising design, sculpture, interior, art history, and watercolor. Exhibited in traveling shows and have illustrated professionally. Member Tau Sigma Delta, Phi Kappa Phi, and A.A.U.P. Excellent references. Available summer or fall, 1955. A 4947

Art: Man, single. Experienced teacher. Trained at Technische Hochschule and Kunstgewerbe Schule, Hanover, Germany. M.A., University of Chicago. Exhibited in U. S. since 1926. One-man shows in New York and Chicago. Available Sept. 1955, for college or art school, preferably near east or west coast. Landscape, portrait, design, life drawing, theory, history of art. A 4948

Art Education: Man, 36, married, 1 child, Ph.D. 10 years' teaching experience, etc. Publications. Accomplished artist. Listed in *Who's Who in American Art*. Member of Phi Delta Kappa, A.A.U.P., College Art Association of America. Desire position to direct and teach graduate and undergraduate art courses in design, art education, painting, graphic arts, crafts, art history. Prefer department head, full professor, or equivalent in college or university. Available summer or fall, 1955. A 4949

- Art (Fine Arts, Stage Arts, Crafts and Art Education):** Woman. Art schools and M.A. from Teachers College, Columbia University. 8 years of college teaching, 10 years of secondary, elementary, and institutional teaching. Broad cultural background. Experience in related arts. Available summer and fall, 1955. A 4950
- Art and Home Economics:** Woman, M.A., 30 years' college experience; desire position teaching art courses related to Home Economics curriculum: costume design, home planning, interior decoration, art appreciation. Can assist Dramatics Director with stage sets and costumes. A 4951
- Biologist:** Man, 37, family, B.S. and M.A. 9 years' teaching experience on college level. General biology, zoology, botany; most experience in bacteriology, parasitology. Extensive research, industrial experience, publications. Excellent references. New England area preferred. Available September, 1955. A 4952
- Biology:** Man, 37, Ph.D., married, 3 children. Present rank, Assistant Professor, with promotion due in July. Formerly Associate Professor of Biology in Midwestern college. Have taught physiology, endocrinology, comparative anatomy, general zoology, parasitology, and histology. Have directed students for graduate degrees. Listed in *Who's Who in the South and Southwest* and *American Men of Science*. Member of Sigma Xi, Phi Sigma, A.A.A.S., A.A.U.P., American Heart Association, and others. Seek position in medical school or liberal arts. Many publications. Prefer West Coast or Midwest. Available June, 1955. A 4953
- Biology, Botany, Zoology:** Man, married, 2 children. Ph.D., Illinois, 28 years' college and university teaching experience; all branches of biology, including supervision of graduate students. Gave papers at A.I.B.S. meetings at Cornell, 1952, and Wisconsin, 1953. Degree in botany, but have taught more zoology. Available June, 1955. A 4954
- Botanist (Plant Physiologist):** Ph.D., man, 39, family, 12 years' experience teaching and research, unusual interest in teaching, have active research program, now in nonacademic administration and public relations, wish to return to academic work September, 1955. A 4955
- Botany:** Man, Ph.D., 28, family. 3 years' experience in land-grant school, largely in research capacity. Prefer to expand teaching activities. Interests broad. Training and experience in the fields of genetics, evolution, taxonomy, biometry, histology, physiology. Member: A.A.U.P., Sigma Xi, Genetics Society of America. Publications. Interested in position with institution of recognized academic standing. Geographical location not restrictive. A 4956
- Botany, Biology, Education:** Man, 32, married, 1 child. B.S. (botany), A.M. (botanical taxonomy), Ph.D. (history and theory of education, biology teaching in U. S. and U. S. S. R.), all Cornell University. Experienced translator Russian materials (biology and education). Three semesters as teaching assistant general botany. Currently administrative and research supervisor, Department of Defense (GS-11). Member Bot. Soc. Am., Am. Soc. Plant Taxonomists, Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi. Excellent references. Desire to teach, preferably general botany, in New England college or university. Available Sept. 1955. Charles R. Freitag, 953 North Longfellow Street, Arlington 5, Va.
- Business Administration, Marketing, Accounting, Secretarial Science, Business and Vocational Education:** Man, 35, married. Broad teaching, manufacturing, business, and governmental experience, secondary, college, and business college. Have taught business administration, insurance, accounting, comprehensive business education, including shorthand, labor relations, labor problems, money and banking, finance, investments, retailing, and economics. Holder of B.S.,

M.B.A., and half completed program for Ph.D. Minimum rank, assistant professor. A 4958

Chemistry: M.S., $2\frac{1}{2}$ years' additional graduate work in chemistry, honorary Sc.D., 15 years' teaching experience, mostly in analytical chemistry, some organic; advanced inorganic. Now head of chemistry department, small college. Prefer to change to institution in which sound scholarship is appreciated. Available June or September, 1955. J. C. Hackney, 111 West Broad St., Mount Pleasant, Iowa.

Chemistry: Ph.D. July 1955, 7 years' Agricultural Experiment Station experience with radioisotopes and blood chemistry. Thesis on radioiodine in large animals; minors physical chemistry and physics. Publications. A 4959

Chemistry: Ph.D. in physical chemistry, desire position in accredited institution. 5 years' recent experience teaching physical, analytical, general, some organic. 12 years of industrial and government research, including atomic energy. 13 publications: history and criticism of classical thermodynamics, statistical design of experiments, properties of heavy water, physical metallurgy. A 4960

Civil Engineering: Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, Ph.D., Registered Professional Engineer, with 18 years of teaching, research and industrial experience invites correspondence re. headship of Civil Engineering Department or Director of Engineering Experiment Station or Director of Research with a university. A 4961

Civil Engineering: Registered civil engineer and educator with family, advanced degrees, and broad background of experience invites correspondence regarding department chairmanship. A 4962

Counseling and Psychology: Man, 37, married. A.B., Swarthmore College; M.A., Univ. of Penna.; all course requirements for Ed.D. in Guidance Dept. of a leading university completed. 6 years' college teaching, 3 years' directing college counseling services. 3 publications in psychology. 2 years in industry and a year in government as a counseling psychologist. Member: A.P.A., N.E.A., N.V.G.A., A.P.G.A., and A.C.P.A. Prefer Atlantic seaboard. Full résumé sent upon request. A 4963

Drama: Designer-Technician. Man, 35, married, 1 child. Ph.D. Northwestern, 5 years' university teaching experience in stage scenery, lighting, theater production, public speaking and allied fields. Now assistant professor. Major: Aesthetics of theatre and theatre design; minor: public speaking. Special interest: lighting. Articles on aesthetics of theatre. Theatre consultant. Now employed at Midwestern university. Prefer position in West in educational rather than professional theatre school. Available fall, 1955. A 4964

Economics: Man, single, Ph.D., 30 years' teaching experience. Publications; professional societies; Specialties: foreign trade; international economic relations; American economic history; labor problems; personnel; economic theory; history of economic thought. A 4965

Economics: Have successfully tried other vocations, but at 50 would now prefer to concentrate on college teaching as I did 1928-43, 1945-46, and in part 1946-51. Have had $1\frac{1}{2}$ years of government service, 7 years in adult liberal education, $2\frac{1}{2}$ years in primary research, plus 25 years' part-time research (two books, numerous journal articles, etc.), and business experience (residential income investment part-time for 25 years, building houses for past two years). If able to write my own ticket would prefer half-time campus teaching, one-quarter time in adult education, and one-quarter time for my family (four young children) and community service. Have worked for Sloan and Ford Foundations, taught

at Arizona (A.B., M.A.), Stanford (Ph.D.), and U.S.C. (also part time at Claremont and Caltech). Subject specialties: price theory, international economics, and national economic policies. Would now prefer a small college in a suburban community, one whose administration encourages efforts to improve teaching and believes firmly in the Bill of Rights. Available any time, any place, where a challenging opportunity awaits. A 4966

Economics and Business Administration: Man, 50, married, 2 children, Ph.D. Broad teaching and research experience in university, college, and federal government service; several languages; publications. Have taught principles of economics, foreign trade, comparative economic systems, marketing, public finance, money and banking, history of economic thought, urban land economics. Available for teaching, research, or both. A 4967

Education: Man, 29, married, A.B. (English), M.A. (English), Ed.D. Five years' teaching, 3 in secondary schools, 2 in college. History and philosophy of education, secondary teaching and curriculum, and the teaching of English. Articles. Honor societies in education and social science. Available June, 1955. A 4968

Education: Man and wife, early forties, desire positions in same institution or neighboring institutions. Man, Ph.D.; special interests: educational administration, curriculum, psychology; experience includes public schools, business, university, public and church-related colleges, departmental and divisional chairmanship, personnel administrator, testing and guidance; wide professional and civic interests; accomplished speaker. Wife, M.A. and additional work; special interests: elementary education, supervision, speech education, with supporting English interest; experience includes public schools, teachers college, university, small college; active in civic and intellectual affairs; accomplished lecturer and reviewer. Opportunity for wife to complete doctorate would be inducement. Available summer or autumn, 1955. A 4969

Education: Man, 35, single, Ph.D. Interested in teaching experimental courses in junior college education of own design, summer 1955. 13 semesters of college experience. Now employed in a junior college. Formerly an associate professor. A 4970

Education, Philosophy of: Man, 38, family. 17 years' teaching experience on all levels: public schools, University of Tennessee, New York University, State University of New York; Ed.D., Teachers College, Columbia University. Published writings and interest in revision of liberal arts and science curriculum toward liberating public education. Seek better position in this work to make use of specialties in method and the arts. Member, Philosophy of Education Society, A.A.U.P., John Dewey Society, National Education Association. Would consider administrator post in liberal arts college or teacher in teachers college. Minimum rank, associate professor. Minimum salary in South, \$8,000, more elsewhere. References. Available September, 1955. A 4971

Education, and/or Physical Education, and/or Administration: Scheduled to complete dissertation for Ed.D. by August. 16 years of administration, teaching, coaching in public schools, colleges, and universities. 4 years of administration and public relations work in business. Especially interested in teacher education. A 4972

Electrical-Agricultural Engineering, Applied Physics: Man 45, married, wife and 4 children, Lutheran, B.Sc., M.Sc., A.E., Ph.D. candidate, Iowa State College, Ex. 1944. Licensed to practice professional engineering thru examinations (Oregon, A.E., 1939; Washington, E.E., 1946). 10 years of original research. 8 years of university teaching, and 4 years of design in industries and U. S. Government. G.S.-11 Civil Service rating, E.E., G.E. Many publications, good to excellent recommendations. *Who Knows—And What, U. S. A., Who's*

Who on the Pacific Coast, Tau Beta Pi, A.K.L., A.A.U.P., A.A.A.S., E.S.A. A.S.E.E., A.I.E.E., etc. Desire connection as Research Engineer, Professor and/or Dept. Head. A 4973

English: Man, 42, single, Harvard Ph.D.; 8 years' experience in large Midwestern state university and large Eastern university teaching courses on all levels in English and comparative literature. Articles published and book just completed. Major field: nineteenth century English and American literature. Minimum rank: assistant professor. Available fall, 1955. A 4974

English: Man, 44, married. Have taught creative writing or literature at Yale, U. of Iowa, Wayne U., Mt. Holyoke (Resident Poet four years), and Columbia (lecturer in short story). Author of 4 novels (one recommended by Book-of-the-Month Club), 4 collections of poetry; contributor to over 40 publications such as *Atlantic*, *S.R.L.*, *Am. Mercury*, *Yale Review*, *L. Home Journal*, *Poetry*, *New Republic*. On staffs of 3 writers' conferences; have made recordings of own work for Harvard Vocarium Series of Modern Poets. Will consider instructorship. A 4975

English: Man, 34, married. M.A., Ph.D., Columbia. Specialty, American literature; minors, Medieval English and Comparative Romantic literature. 6 years' college teaching, 2 years' professional writing. Credentials upon request. Desire assistant professorship in small or medium-size college or university. Available immediately. A 4976

English: Man, 27, married, no children, Ph.D. 3 years' experience in large universities, including Survey of English Literature, Survey of American Literature, composition, humanities, business English. Publications. Would like opportunity to teach American literature and position with possibility of advancement. East preferred, but would consider position with future anywhere. A 4977

English (Middle Ages, Renaissance): Ph.D. August 1955. Teaching experience: 2 years part-time, 2 years full-time. All types freshman composition; vocabulary building; English for the foreign-born; biography; novel; much committee work. Publications: abstracts of M.L.A. meeting paper; another article being considered by journal; two others nearing readiness. Male, 29, married, 2 children, veteran. A 4979

English: Man, 37. Harvard Ph.D., Ford Fellow. Phi Beta Kappa. Publications, book in preparation. Major fields: American, 17th-century English literature. Teaching 8 years at 3 large universities: freshman literature and composition, public speaking, English novel, surveys of English and American literature, advanced American literature. Preference: east of Mississippi. Available September, 1955. A 4980

English: Man, 31, married, 2 children. A.B., A.M., Ph.D., University of Michigan. Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Eta Sigma, several other high academic honors. Publications. Member A.A.U.P., M.L.A., S.C.M.L.A., C.E.A., N.C.T.E. 10 years' teaching and advanced research experience. Special interests: sophomore course, literary criticism, Romantic period. Prefer university or strong liberal arts college in East or Midwest. Excellent references. Available fall, 1955. A 4981

English or American Studies: Man, 29, single, veteran. M.A. in English, Ph.D. in American Civilization. 5 years' college teaching: composition, survey of English literature, various courses in American literature. Desire position in college with better than average academic standards and strong liberal arts program. Minimum salary, \$4500 for 9 months. Available fall, 1955. A 4982

Fine Arts: Man, 34, married, 1 child. B.Sc. in Ed., and M.A. in ceramics, Ohio State University. Did postgraduate work at Cranbrook Academy of Art and

Cleveland Institute of Art. Specialized in ceramics and sculpture. 4 years' teaching experience in present college level, specializing in ceramics. Can also teach sculpture, enameling on metal, design, drawing, painting, interior design, and history of architecture. Have written articles for professional magazine. Work in ceramics in both local and national exhibitions. Member of A.A.U.P. and College Art Association. Present rank, assistant professor. Excellent references. Available fall, 1955. A 4983

Fine Arts: Man, 36, married, 1 child, Ph.D. Latin American study and travel. Emphasis on painting, art education, design, crafts, graphic arts, art history. 10 years' teaching experience and research. Listed in *Who's Who in American Art*. Exhibited nationally. Publications. Member of A.A.U.P., Phi Delta Kappa, Sigma Delta Pi, College Art Association of America. Desire position in college or university with undergraduate and graduate work. Prefer department chairmanship or full professor. Available summer or fall, 1955. A 4984

French: Man, Ph.D. in Romance languages, foreign travel, residence and study. Speaking knowledge of French. Publication. A 4985

French: Man, 42, French-born, married, graduate of the Sorbonne (Licence ès-Lettres), Institute of Phonetics, Institute of Ethnology, also School of Oriental Studies, Paris. 16 years' college and university teaching and research experience, later Director of French Cultural Institute abroad. Several books and articles published in comparative linguistics, literature, and French colonial history. World-wide travel and residence, U. S. A., Europe, Asia. Presently Assistant Professor in a New England college. Available June, 1955. A 4986

French and/or Administrative position: Man, 32, married, no children, B.A. and M.A. in French Literature and European History, Southern Methodist University, Fulbright scholar, 1 year Faculté des Lettres, University of Paris. 3 years' teaching, 2 years' responsible educational administration. Widely traveled, 3 years' residence abroad. Available September, 1955, prefer West or Southwest. A 4987

French, German, Spanish: Man, 32, married. A.B., *magna cum laude*; M.A., Ph.D. leading university. 3½ years' teaching experience, including summer sessions, at college and university level. A.C.L.S. Fellowship. Member A.A.U.P., S.A.M.L.A., Phi Eta Sigma, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Alpha Theta. Membership in the Linguistic Society of America pending. Publication. Seeking a position with possibility of advancement and tenure; trial period is quite acceptable. Excellent references. Available June or September, 1955. A 4988

French, Latin: Professor in a Northern university. Experienced at all levels—high school, undergraduate, and graduate school—7 years' among French people, teaching over-all French pronunciation. Publications in linguistics. Latin grammar in progress. Best of recommendations. Man, 40. Desire position at college or university, in dry climate. Available September, 1955. A 4989

French, Spanish, German: Man, single. Class work for Ph.D. completed. Experience: 12 years' high school, 12 years' university. Rank, associate professor. Some graduate work at The Sorbonne. Travelled extensively. Available in September, 1955. A 4990

German: Man, 40, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins. 6 years' teaching experience, language and literature. Chief interests: teaching and humanities; some publications; also long musical experience. Location not decisive factor, but prefer Pacific Northwest. A 4991

German: Man, Ph.D., Wisconsin; German major, education minor; twenty-fifth year in present position, teaching German, assisting education, and mathe-

- maties. Wish to change to have Social Security benefits. Executive experience in small college. Prefer Protestant college with opportunity for work in theology. Excellent references from college and church leaders. Now writing college text on "Successful Town and Rural Schools." Author, "Temperance Plays for Radio or Stage." Experience and study abroad. A 4992
- German: Man, 55, retired German high-school teacher in good health, American citizen, doctor's degree, 3 years' teaching experience at an American college, want position as teacher of German or German and chemistry. Special qualification: German for chemists. Waldemar A. Scheyer, 326 Maclay St., Harrisburg, Pa.
- German, Latin, Greek: German-born, Lutheran, Ph.D., 24 years' teaching experience in this country, associate professor, married to American artist of national renown, 1 child; desire change to challenging liberal arts institution; devoted, understanding, alert. A 4994
- German, Latin, and Russian: Man, married, educated in Russia, Germany, and Austria, and U. S. A. American citizen of good standing, 25 years' teaching experience in high schools and colleges. Ph.D. from Innsbruck, Austria, present rank professor. Widely travelled in Europe, South and North America. Outstanding record for teaching, conduct, and character. Excellent references. Available for position in fall, 1955. A 4995
- History: Former instructor in History and English at MIT (1946-1948), wish to return to teaching after 6 years of government service. B.S. in Economics, Harvard; M.Ed., Boston State Teachers College; graduate study at Harvard School of Education, Georgetown and George Washington Universities. Minimum entrance level, assistant professor. Prepared to handle U. S. and modern European political and industrial history, and principles of economics. Age 41, married, 1 child, widely travelled. Languages, French and German. Salary secondary to opportunity for effective teaching and tenure. A 4996
- History: Man, 32, married, 1 child. Doctorate in American history (specialization in Civil War and Reconstruction). 5 years' experience in college teaching. Have taught American history and Western Civilization survey courses, as well as advanced offerings in American history. Articles and reviews in learned journals. Presently a tenure-member of a small, private university. Available as early as June, 1955. A 4997
- History: Man, 37, married, 2 children, veteran. European and American education. M.A., Columbia University. Dissertation nearing completion, Ph.D. expected by fall, 1955. Phi Alpha Theta. Field: Western Civilization. Major interest: modern Europe, middle ages. Specialities: early modern Europe; Germany, Austria. 7 years' teaching experience at large eastern college. Research and lecture tour abroad. Publications: articles and reviews here and abroad. Wartime service: U. S. intelligence. Desire teaching position with opportunity to continue research and writing. Available September, 1955. A 4998
- History, Modern European: Man, 43, married. Ph.D., Harvard. 8 years' college teaching experience, more recently 4 years' service with State Department in Germany. Main interests: modern Germany, modern Russia, Renaissance and Reformation, Western Civilization. At present teaching at Midwestern university. Available September, 1955. A 4999
- History, Political Science: Man, 33, married. Ph.D., University of Michigan. 5 years' college teaching experience in European and American history and political science. Also qualified to teach introductory course in economics. Now employed by state-supported college. Published articles. Wish to find position in better locality. A 5000
- History: See Political Science, A 5021

Journalism: Man, 50, married, professor with tenure at Kansas State College. 20 years' college teaching experience. Administrative experience: 6 years' college press superintendent and 5 years' journalism department head. Education: A.B., A.M. in Ed., course work for doctor's degree interrupted by World War II. Journalism department head at Baylor University following release from service. Extensive training in vocational education and psychology. Specialties: Typography, printing, advertising, newspaper management, public relations, and advising staffs of student publications. Listed in *Who's Who*. Salary not primary consideration. Health, energy, and forebearers portend that 65 will be too young to retire. Available September 1. A 5001

Marketing, Economics, Business Administration: Man, 32, married, B.A., M.B.A.; Ph.D. course and written requirements completed at New York University (Graduate School of Business Administration). President of small business 2 years. Former Assistant Professor of Economics at a large Southwestern college. 6 years of college and university teaching plus practical business background. Courses taught include: marketing research, retailing, salesmanship, business cycles, money and banking, principles of marketing, principles of economics, labor relations, personnel administration, business organization and management, American industry and economic geography, foreign trade. Interested in position as teacher, in administration, or with industry. A 5002

Mathematics: Man, family. Ph.D. Teaching experience at all levels. Applied mathematics research experience in physical sciences, statistics, and biology. Publications. Prefer position with institution interested in good teaching and research. Available June or September, 1955. A 5003

Mathematics: Man, 28, family. Ph.D., Harvard, 1950. 4 years as instructor at leading state university. Publications. Interested in both research and teaching. Desire good position, not necessarily permanent, at private institution. A 5004

Mathematics: Man, 34, single. M.S. in Ed. with major in mathematics, University of Notre Dame. 5 years' experience teaching college mathematics in a Land Grant university. Member, Math. Assoc. of America and A.A.U.P. Available June or September, 1955. Credentials will be sent on request. A 5005

Mathematics and Librarian: Wanted, summer positions by college math. professor and by college librarian. Elmer A. Habel, Pensacola Jr. College, Pensacola, Fla.

Mathematics and/or Physics: Master's degree in engineering and postgraduate work in mathematics. Excellent references, with nearly 25 years' teaching experience. Age 61. Author of a text in algebra. Desire part-time position, but will accept full-time position. A 5007

Music: Man, 27, married, 2 children. B.A., M.A., 1 year college level experience. Musicology, music history, instrumental methods, orchestration, piano, theory, conducting, and music literature. Experienced orchestral and choral conductor. Member A.A.U.P., A.M.S., and American Symphony Orchestra League. References available, Cornell University Educational Placement Bureau. Available immediately. A 5008

Music: Graduate, Institute of Musical Art, piano. B.S., Juilliard School. M.M., University of Southern California; Europe 2 years. 6 years' college teaching, 20 years' private. Piano (private or class), theory and ear training, musicology, choral. Member A.A.U.P., M.T.N.A., Pi Kappa Lambda. Available for piano workshop demonstrations, summer, 1955. A 5009

Music: Man, 40, B.A., M.A. Foreign Studies. University level, adult education, private teaching—12 years. Composer, lecturer, publication. Fields:

theory, composition, history, piano. Challenging position sought; opportunity more important than salary and location. Available summer and fall, 1955.

A 5010

Music: Man, 54, single. A.B. (*cum laude*) and A.M. from Harvard University. 2 years of counterpoint and composition in Paris with Nadia Boulanger. 30 years of teaching experience in 4 eastern colleges. Full professorial rank since 1952. Sacred and secular choral music published. 4 prizes won for choral compositions. Keyboard improvising in public concerts. Teacher of harmony, counterpoint, harmonic analysis, form analysis, composition, piano, organ, and introductory courses in music for the layman. Organist and choirmaster. Bi-lingual (French). A.A.U.P., C.M.A., S.M.I.L.A.C. *Who's Who in the East, Who's Who in American Education, Composers in America*. Available for summer teaching, 1955.

A 5011

Parasitology, Protozoology: M.S., Emory University; Ph.D., University of California. Sigma Xi. 12 years' college teaching; 5 years' malaria control work, and research. 50, Methodist. 2 recent publications.

A 5012

Philosophy: Man, Canadian, 42, married; B.A. (Honor Economics), McMaster University; M.A., Ph.D. (Philosophy), University of Toronto; F.R.S.A., England. Canadian Army, 4 years, overseas. 6 years' teaching experience in introduction to philosophy, ancient and modern philosophy, logic, philosophy of science, English literature and philosophy. Can be available September, 1955.

A 5013

Philosophy, English Literature, and Economics: M.A., University of Oxford, England; 16 years' successful experience in both undergraduate and graduate teaching in England and U. S. A.; desire appointments for summer, 1955, and for academic year 1955-56.

A 5014

Physical Education: Man, 32, family, Doctor of Physical Education. Experience at all levels—elementary, junior high, high school, college, and university; 6 years on college and university level. Primarily interested in physical education professional preparation. Present time assistant professor of physical education and coach of basketball at eastern state university. Available August, 1955.

A 5015

Physical Education: Man, 40, married, 2 children. Liberal arts college teaching experience—10 years, includes physical education, athletic coaching, intramurals, student counseling, and lecturing. Membership in national professional organizations; publications. Broad experience and wide acquaintance in the field. Desire position in physical education, administration, and teaching. Rank and responsibility in keeping with experience and ability. Available immediately.

A 5016

Physics: Ph.D., theoretical physics; M.S., mathematics. Man, 29, married, no children. Sigma Xi, A.P.S., A.A.A.S., A.A.P.T., A.A.U.P. 5 years' teaching experience at college level, including 1 graduate course. 8 research papers. Veteran, no reserve status. Excellent references. Seeking permanent position (initial trial period perfectly acceptable). Available June or September, 1955.

A 5018

Physics: Man, 27, married, 2 children. B.S. in physics, M.I.T. 1 year graduate study, Columbia University. 1½ years' college teaching experience, physics instructor.

A 5019

Piano Class Specialist: Man, 31, B.Mus. and M.Mus., University of Southern California. Experienced in setting up and/or participating in functional piano classes for music-education majors, minors, and elementary education majors. Piano class demonstrations at Music Teachers National Association and Music

- Educators National Conference, national and regional conferences. Member, national piano committees. Executive Board member state Music Teachers National Association. 1 summer in Fontainebleau, France, with Nadia Boulanger (general background) and Robert Casadesus (piano). Ability to present piano concerts and participate in ensembles. Want position only in the West. Available September, 1955. A 5020
- Political Science: Man, family, LL.B., recent Ph.D., Columbia. 4 years' research at L.S.E., London; 5 years' college teaching experience in the Far East; 20 years' professional experience. Fields: International Relations and Law, Far Eastern History and Government, Political Theory. Professional organization and some publications. Seek position as assistant or associate professor. Available June or September, 1955. A 5021
- Political Science: Man, 42, married. B.A., M.A., and extensive additional graduate study. 15 years' secondary and 5 years' college teaching experience. Fields: public administration, American national government, state and local government, theory, parties, Far East, international relations, comparative government. Desire position as assistant professor or instructor. Available at once. A 5022
- Political Scientist: B.A., 1947; M.A., 1949; Ph.D., 1955. 2 years' practical experience as administrator in federal government. 3 years' teaching experience on secondary level. Available for fall semester, 1955. Specialities include public administration, American governments, international organizations, European governments, and public opinion and pressure groups. A 5023
- Political Science and History: Man, 26, single, M.A.; Ph.D. expected summer, 1955. Extensive travel; knowledge of Russian and Chinese languages; some library experience. Excellent recommendations. Available fall of 1955. A 5024
- Political Science, History: Man, 44, married. Several years department head in college, plus varied university teaching. Broad experience in teaching, writing, and government service—administrative and legislative. 3 books; articles in journals. American government (national, state, local) and administration, comparative government, international relations. Salary: open. A 5025
- Radio and TV: Man, married, under 40, 1 child, M.A. degree, 3 years' teaching experience, 8 years' commercial experience. Extensive practical work in radio programming. Now teaching in state university. Available summer and/or fall, 1955. A 5026
- Religion and/or Philosophy, Psychology of Religion: Young man, S.T.M., Ph.D., widely travelled, full credentials, desire position, preferably in eastern college or university for September, 1955. A 5027
- Russian, Mathematics, Political Science: Man, 50, single, M.A. (Slavic philology), M.S. (math.), Ph.D. (political science), University of Bonn. Russian—mother tongue, 66 semester hours in Russian language, literature, and methods of teaching, 10 years of teaching experience, publications in Russian, research work concerning Russia. California, Colorado, etc., secondary and junior college teacher's licenses. Present rank—Professor of Mathematics, Political Science, and German, Chairman, Department of Social Sciences; 4 years' teaching experience in a New England college. Desire teaching and/or research position. A 5028
- Secretarial Science and Methods Course Specialist: Woman, 38, M.B.A. (Denver), further graduate study (Southern California, Columbia). Recognized authority, teaching aids and materials; salaried contributor and editorial associate, leading

professional journal. Prepared convention materials, National Business Teachers Association. Member, office holder, leading national and regional professional organizations; member Delta Pi Epsilon. Chairman, Committee on Methods and Materials in Business Education for Delta Pi Epsilon publication. Past National Officer, Pi Omega Pi. Successful teaching experience, 5 years' high school, 9 years' college. West preferred; available June, 1955. A 5029

Slavic Languages: Russian, Polish, Czech, Ukrainian, Old-Church-Slavic, Comparative linguistics: Man, 44, Ph.D., M.A., married, 2 children. Also qualified in German, French and Librarianship. 15 years of university experience. Widely travelled. Publications. Listed in professional directories. Interested in associate professorship and higher. A 5030

Sociology: Man, 30, married, 1 child. B.A., M.A., all Ph.D. requirements completed except thesis, leading universities. 2 years' college teaching, 1 year research, 1 year administration. Writing and editing experience. Major fields: population, urban, statistical methods. Available September, 1955. A 5031

Sociology: Man, 29, married, one child. Research and public speaking experience. 3 years' teaching at state university: family, minorities, community, principles, theory. 1 article, M.A., Ph.D. residence complete, thesis in progress, Columbia. References and details on request. Available summer or September, 1955. A 5032

Sociology, Anthropology; specializing in India, Indochina, South East Asia, and the Far East, regional cultures, current history, and problems: Man, 42, French-born, married, graduate in anthropology, sociology, Far Eastern civilization and languages (Sorbonne, Institute of Ethnology, Institute of Phonetics, School of Oriental Studies, Paris). 11 consecutive years of field-work in Asia: 4 on the staff of a South East Asian university, 1 in China, 6 in Japan as associate of a well-known Far Eastern research center, later director and in charge of Franco-Japanese cultural relations. Author of several books on the Far Eastern cultures, history, and linguistics. Others in progress. Also elementary Sanskrit, Pali, South East Asia languages, Japanese. Teaching in the U. S. from 1948. Available June, 1955. A 5033

Sociology, Education, Social Sciences, Psychology, Administration, Public Relations: Man, 42, married, 1 child; Ph.D. (Sociology), 1949; M.A. (Education), 1946, Ohio State University. Also A.B. (Arts and Science); B.D., Social Work, and other study. Over 250 quarter hours in Social Sciences alone. Competent in sociology (theory, research, marriage and family, race, social psychology); education (principles, history, philosophy); history; political science; economics; psychology; cultural anthropology; social work; counseling, and others. Approximately 10 years' college teaching, administration, and public relations (Dean of Men); government research, and some secondary experience. Publications. Available fall, 1955. A 5034

Sociology and Social Work: Woman, 47; M.A. and Ph.D. residence requirement. Former Director of Surveys, a State Welfare Department. Trained in empirical research methods. 5 years' teaching experience at college level in preprofessional social work courses in Social Psychology, The Community, Fields of Social Work, Rural-Urban Sociology, Consumer's Economics. 2 years' teaching courses in social work curriculum of laws, case analysis, and recording in a university accredited for undergraduate social work training. Supervision of field work. Trained in writing techniques for publicity. Phi Beta Kappa; A.K.D. Available now. A 5035

Spanish: South American professor, Ph.D., author and researcher; single, Protestant; 15 years' teaching experience, 5 in American universities. Fields: Spanish, Spanish and Spanish-American Literature, Latin-American Culture. Publications: books and articles. Available at once as lecturer, summer school professor, visiting professor, assistant professor. Any location. Salary according to abilities. A 5036

Speech and Drama: Man, 35, married, veteran. Ph.D., 10 years' experience in college teaching and play directing, both in college and in community and professional summer theatre. Major fields: Theatre, speech fundamentals, voice and diction, and radio. Considerable administrative experience. Publications, professional memberships, and excellent references. Available June, 1955. A 5037

Statistics: Man, 44, married. Ph.D. in economics, M.A. in education, B.S. in business administration. Teaching experience in public schools, teachers college, and universities. Publications in economics, education, and statistics. Research and consulting experience. Original contribution in industrial applications of statistics. Seek university appointment in applied statistics. Also interested in responsible position as research director. Open to other suggestions. Now teaching in eastern university. A 5038

Zoology: Ph.D. in entomology. Man, 33, married, 2 children. Currently on faculty of Big Ten University; desire another location. Teaching interests and experience include general zoology, parasitology, entomology, and pathogenic bacteriology. Sigma Xi; several publications, some sponsored by U. S. Public Health Service. A 5039

EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENTS

ELIZABETH KING, DIR.

Placing teachers and administrators in schools
and colleges throughout the country.

Music Division:

Music Teachers Placement Service

516 Fifth Avenue

New York 36, N. Y.

Member National Association of Teachers' Agencies



Ogunquit

by the Sea, Maine



A rare combination of smooth, sandy, uncrowded beaches, rolling dunes and majestic rocky cliffs. Magnificent scenery. Famous artists' Colony. Summer theatre, shopping centre, deep sea fishing, golf, movies, numerous hotels, guest houses, cottages, motels, restaurants, tea rooms.

Write for attractive illustrated folder

OGUNQUIT PUBLICITY BUREAU

Ogunquit, Maine

OUTSTANDING PUBLICATIONS ON THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

Association of American Colleges Bulletin, edited by Guy E. Snavelly. Issued four times a year. \$3.00.

Financing Liberal Education—The Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting, 1954. Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution. (*Bulletin*, March 1954.) \$1.50.

Teaching with Books—A Study of College Libraries, by Harvie Branscomb. Association of American Colleges, Washington, D. C., and American Library Association, Chicago. \$2.50.

College Music—An Investigation by Randall Thompson. The Macmillan Company, New York. 279 pages. \$2.00.

Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges, by Edward Safford Jones. Macmillan Company, New York. 434 pages. 50 cents.

Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities, by Edward Safford Jones. Questions used in senior terminal examinations in the classics, English, modern languages, philosophy, art. 112 pages. 50 cents.

Orders for the above publications may be sent to the

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

special message for faculty members: is your income safe?

- from disabling accidents?
- from confining illness?
- from hospital—surgical expenses?

If you're a faculty member of a school or college that was *founded* with a church affiliation, you can enjoy a *low cost* health, accident and hospital insurance plan written by Ministers Life and Casualty Union. You'll get *liberal* protection against hospital and surgical expenses *plus* benefits from loss of time due to disability.

Low Cost Premiums are possible because you are considered a "preferred risk". MLCU, since its organization in 1900, has sold insurance *by mail only*. No agency or commission expenses to run up costs. These big savings are passed on to you!

Benefits for loss of time protect your income while you're laid up. Coverage from \$75 to \$300 a month is available. For example, under MLCU's "Advance" 2 Unit plan, you receive as much as \$150 per month up to two years for total accidental disability—up to 14 months for confining sickness. Accidental death or loss of hands, feet or eyes pays up to \$5000—other disabilities proportionately less. You receive up to \$37.50 for doctor's fees in non-disabling injuries. Hospital and surgical benefits are equally liberal.

The cost of this plan? Only \$8.50 per quarter for men between 35 and 40, with hospital-surgical riders at small additional cost. Other typically low rates for men and women dependent on age.

Group Plan Advantages provide insurance that can be obtained without proof of insurability, without observing any waiting period after the group is accepted and with the provision that premiums can be deducted automatically from your salary.

You may organize a group accident, health and hospital insurance plan for faculty members of your school and enjoy these advantages. *Write for information.*

THE MINISTERS LIFE & CASUALTY UNION

Legal Reserve—Non Assessable

Fill out the coupon today—get all the details on MLCU insurance plans!



The Ministers Life & Casualty Union
152 Ministers Life Bldg., Minneapolis 16, Minn.
In Canada: 30 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5, Ontario

Please send me complete information on:
Men's Accident, Health, Hospital Plan ☐
The Women's Accident, Health, Hospital Plan ☐
Faculty Group Insurance Plan ☐
Life Insurance Data ☐

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
Birth Date _____ College or School _____ Position _____

SOLD ONLY BY MAIL

**THE
BALTIMORE
TEACHERS AGENCY**

(Established in 1925)

We offer a reliable, nationwide school and college placement service under the direction of a staff of experienced school and college teachers. If you are a teacher seeking a position, or an executive seeking a teacher, write for information.

WILLIAM K. YOCUM, Mgr.
516 N. Charles St.
Baltimore 1, Md.

*Member National Association
of Teachers Agencies*

**The *Bulletin*
of the
American Association
of
University Professors**

**Subscription
\$3.00 a year**

Editorial Office:
**1785 Massachusetts
Ave., N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.**

Subscribe to—

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

Because:

- America today should be well informed about the fastest growing phase of education.
- It is the only national periodical devoted to the junior-college movement.
- It is edited by one of America's most distinguished educators, JAMES W. REYNOLDS of the University of Texas.
- The live, forward-looking program of research and service is published in the JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL.

Subscription price, \$3.50 a year

1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE WASHINGTON 6, D. C.



AN INCOME YOU CAN'T OUTLIVE.... AN INCOME THAT KEEPS STEP WITH THE TIMES....

You'll need *both* features for your retirement income.

Money put into an annuity during your working years comes back during your retirement as a lifetime income consisting of both principal and interest. But if your annuity doesn't include a hedge against inflation, your retirement income may not give you the purchasing power you expect for your later years.

A pioneering type of annuity, available only to college staff members, now tries to do something about this. Educators may pay up to 50% of their annuity premiums to the new College Retirement Equities Fund; the balance of the premium to TIAA.

The unique CREF variable annuity is based upon common stocks; it will pay more annuity dollars when common stock prices and earnings are high—generally, when the cost of living is high. The TIAA annuity pays a level number of dollars regardless of economic trends, thereby giving greater purchasing power when the cost of living is low. This balanced system tends to hedge against both inflation and deflation.

Any employee of a college or university is eligible. Write for further details; we employ no agents.

**TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA**

COLLEGE RETIREMENT EQUITIES FUND

522 Fifth Avenue

New York 36, N. Y.